

THE STUDENT WORLD

A quarterly magazine published at 13 Rue Calvin, Geneva
by the World's Student Christian Federation

Dr. W. A. VISSER 't HOOFT *Editor*

VOLUME XXIX

Third Quarter, 1936

NUMBER 3

EDITORIAL

Have you not read that He created them male and female ?

Is there anything more to be said about the relations between men and women ? Has not the subject been dealt with so exhaustively that the time has come to adjourn the discussion ?

It is true that the modern books in various languages which try to shed new light on this age-old problem would fill a good-sized library, and that they approach the subject from almost every imaginable viewpoint. But, curiously enough, one point of view seems consistently to have been overlooked, among Christians as well as among non-Christians... the point of view of God as given to us in His Revelation.

The situation is well described in a letter of the S.C.M. leader who first proposed that a Number of The Student World should be devoted to this subject. He says : " I have come lately to feel keenly that Christian thinking here is weaker than anywhere, for all that is hailed as "enlightened" is at bottom mesmerized by psychologism, biology, and liberal equalitarianism. Many Christians who, in other spheres, have begun to

discern landmarks that do not belong to those "de-bunked" religions, have none here. And yet obviously psychology and biology have to be taken into full account."

We have no landmarks because we have not read, marked, learned, and inwardly digested that "male and female created He them". Until we can find out what that means and what that implies, no amount of good-will, no amount of information and common sense will be of any avail to help us out of our present disorder. For the root of our troubles is not that we are lacking in moral energy, but rather that we have lost the way, that we do not even know what goal we should attempt to reach, that we have forgotten the eternal meaning of the man-woman relationship.

This Number of The Student World is an attempt to show that landmarks do exist. The one conviction which these authors of widely-differing backgrounds have in common is that God has not left us without witness to His Will for the relations between man and woman, and that this witness is relevant to our every-day problems. They do not ask us to forget or neglect what we have learned from "the world", from the psychologists and other teachers, for they know that we need all the help we can get to find our way through the labyrinth; but they maintain that all our man-made knowledge needs to be determined by and based upon a God-given order. What that order is, and how it affects man and woman before and after, in and outside of marriage: these are the questions which need to be answered anew. May the very provisional answers given in this Number lead many to discover something of the inexhaustible content of the message that our manhood and our womanhood is neither an accident nor a merely biological fact, but that

male and female created He them.

V. 't H.

Man and Woman in the Bible

ANNA PAULSEN

It is one of the distinguishing marks of times of change and breaking-up that all the essential questions come up again and demand a new answer. Inherited and traditional answers cannot be simply adopted, but must have their value tested and be worked out and asserted as one's own. Among these essential questions is the sex question, the question of the right ordering of the relations of man and woman with one another. The relation of the sexes is without doubt one of the battle-fields where a new attitude is being struggled for. In the breaking-up of the whole of life which is in process, it may often seem to us as though nothing more were secure; all the values hitherto valid are thrown into the melting-pot. We seek for solid ground, for a place where we can find footing in order to orientate ourselves. In such a situation we look with a passionate interest for the answer of the Bible.

The word of the Bible concerning the relations of man and woman is not given in any single sentence, dogma or ethical doctrine, but is presented in a wealth of individual features in ancient stories, songs, proverbs and narratives of the most varied kind. Even the great utterances of the New Testament gain their full significance only when they are seen in that context and on that background. In the old stories at the beginning of the Bible, which stand like an arched gateway over its entrance, we meet a series of important utterances. They seem at first to point in different directions, and yet closer inspection shows that they supplement one another in a very profound sense.

The Beginning of Relations

On the first page of the Bible we read the great clear word : "God created man in His own image, in the image of God created He him; male and female created He them." Man and woman are here placed side by side, both immediately

from God and to God, destined to bear His image, together subject to the blessing : "Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth and subdue it."

The second Creation narrative (chap. ii., 4 ff.) adds to their position *beside* one another the position of the two sexes *for* one another in the difference of their functions. Adam is first of all alone among all created things and among the beasts which were created with him on the sixth day. Then the consciousness of loneliness comes over him ; he lacks a help corresponding to him, and God determines to give him such help : "It is not good that the man should be alone." Then all the beasts are led past him, for him to give them names. He recognizes them and gives each of them its name ; but among them all he finds no being to correspond with him, no *vis-à-vis* to give him an answer. Then God creates woman from his rib and leads her to him. Adam exclaims : "Now at length it is she, bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh : she shall be called *Ishsha* (woman), because she was taken out of *Ish* (man)" (Gen. ii., 18-23). The answer, the help meet for him, which he did not find in the whole realm of the rest of Creation, is here given to man. In the early dawn of history there rises the joy which has since then found ever-new expression as men and women have found and recognized one another in their destiny of mutual fulfilment. The splendour of unspoiledness and purity lies over their relation in that morning hour of history. "And they were both naked, the man and his wife, and were not ashamed." The woman is made for him, for the man, and apportioned to him, says the old account. He for his part will leave father and mother and cleave to his wife, so that they both are one flesh : so closely tied is the bond which encircles them.

The Fall of Mankind

This condition of purity comes to an end through the common fall of man and woman. The story which tells us of it — an ancient myth ("A myth is a story in which inward decision is objectified through outward action"¹) — is so

¹ Sören Kierkegaard.

profound that one is continually discovering new mysterious features in it. Man and woman fall together; they both in common take part in the carrying out of the decision. In that very fact is revealed the fateful depth of their connection. The impulse comes from the woman; her receptivity, her accessibility is the weak point which offers itself to the serpent as starting-point for the temptation. So she is involved in the conversation concerning God, and is misled to doubt His goodness; she looks at the fruit, feels its enticement, takes and eats and gives to her husband, and he eats too. Adam falls through Eve and Eve falls through Adam. Their common fall is the Fall of humanity; for God created man male and female. If one were to load the entire guilt upon Eve as the first tempted one, and to unburden Adam at her expense, one would make her alone into Adam the bearer of the original decision.

They fall in common, and now both stand in shame. "They knew that they were naked; and they . . . made themselves aprons." Their sexual belonging together is stained by sin from now on; this most passionate and strongest impulse of man becomes in a special way an expression of the egoistic will to life. Here especially does it become evident that man desires to belong to himself, to assert himself against the other and to lay claim upon the other for himself. Man is loose from God; as he is no longer anchored in Him, his existence has lost the basis which bore it up. He belongs to himself and yet cannot come to rest in himself, for he does not ultimately dispose of himself. This man loosed from God cannot any longer belong in freedom to another human being either, but must degrade him to a means to his own ends. From now on, sin stamps every area of life and especially the sexual life. The sexual is not sin; but without sin there is no sexual desire as a sensual lust. "By reason of the fact that man and woman with their masculinity and femininity desire to belong, not to one another but to themselves, their sexual life becomes an object of shame, and bashfulness, paradoxically, a virtue" (Karl Barth).

As they are at one in their shame, so they are both in flight from God. Adam and his wife hide themselves from

the presence of the Lord God amongst the trees of the garden. Both are called forth by God to answer for themselves, and are struck by His curse. To Adam there comes the word that the ground is cursed for his sake. The blessing that had been set upon it ("Subdue the earth") is thus turned into a curse. The curse of God strikes the woman in a special way in her sexual nature. She holds the generative task within her nature as a whole in a different way from man: "In sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband". Eve becomes the instrument of the maintenance of life, Mother of all living, as Adam calls her. God maintains the mankind which now is subject to His curse, with a view to a goal, the redemption, which He has determined (chap. iii., 15). So woman, as bearer of life, becomes at the same time bearer of the promise.

The De-Personalization of Marriage

Now that the connection of man and woman is robbed of its original meaning, the question of the right ordering of their relations to one another becomes one of the fundamental questions of history. As it signifies riches and fullness on the one hand, so this area of life is on the other hand also a source of distress and of shame. Over it there always hovers the danger that the one may degrade the other to be the object of the fulfilment of his own life, to be a means for himself; and that has its effect especially upon woman, who is the dependent part in a sexual relation. There is no more powerful expression of the fallen-ness of the creature than the fallen-ness of the harlot.

Even in the Old Testament there lies a deep shadow over the life of woman in this respect. The people of Israel is connected as regards law and social life with the other Near Eastern countries, and shares with them its marriage laws also. It is quite clear, and may be proved from many features, that polygamy existed in the patriarchal age. Adam, Isaac and Jacob have secondary wives besides their chief wives. Jacob serves for Rachel and Leah, and thus wins them as his possession. The Seventh Commandment of the Sinai Decalogue has not in the first instance the

meaning which we are accustomed to read into it from Luther's Catechism, but forbids the encroachment of a man upon the property of another, of which his wife also forms a part. The wife is mentioned along with the other possessions as one piece among others; she is indeed given the first place within that framework in the second edition of the Law in Deuteronomy (Exod. xx., 14-17; Deut. v., 18-21). Even when the Rabbis at a later time, under the influence of prophetic insight, make monogamy their law, the wife still remains the property of the husband, a thing, an object at his disposal. That is most clearly evident in the divorce law (Deut. xxiv., 1-4). It is indeed the special character of the Divine order of the Old and the New Covenants that it does not transform the law on its own account. The Revelation of God places man before the eternal God Whose Will he has to obey, and thus brings him from within into a new relation to his environment. It lays the deepest possible foundation for a new relationship between master and servant, man and wife, but allows the existing social structure to continue in being.

The New Status of Woman in the New Testament

In the fullness of time the order of marriage, the relation of man and wife, has been transformed from top to bottom by the Gospel. As Christ gives a new exposition of the Law, He discloses also the real meaning of the Seventh Commandment. Several facts combine to give a new form to the relationship of the sexes. One of the revolutionizing elements is the new status of woman. From the point of view of the Gospel she is seen as a person in the full sense of the term, as a human being who is reached by the Call of God and has to give to Eternity her own answer, which none but she can give. We know how Jesus called woman into His fellowship, how He sought after her faith just as much as after that of man; and that presents us with a change of inexpressible significance. Woman, thus raised to the status of a person, can and may no longer be degraded in sexual relations to an object for man, to a mere sex-being and instinct-object. Jesus consciously carried out this transformation in the view of marriage by taking from man the right to separate from

his wife when he pleases. "Whosoever putteth away his wife... committeth adultery." The bond that connects them is bound up with an institution of God, and therefore cannot be arbitrarily loosed from one side; whoever enters into a marriage undertakes an obligation the loosing from which does not lie within his pleasure. How new this conception of Jesus is can be most clearly seen in its effect upon the disciples: "His disciples say unto Him, If the case of the man be so with his wife, it is not good to marry" (Matt. xix., 10). They have hitherto not understood marriage in its profound meaning at all, but looked at it only from the man's point of view. Therefore they are afraid lest an unbearable fetter may be laid upon man by this definition. For Jesus, on the other hand, marriage is a mutual tie of two human beings before God, in which neither can be a thing for the other, but each must be a fully valid person, a human being who stands before God. These two belong to one another, and bind themselves to mutual faithfulness from person to person.

The New Estimate of the Body

The second point from which there proceeds an inward transformation of the conception of marriage is the new estimate of the body. From the Resurrection of Jesus there falls an entirely new light upon the body. It is no longer something or other that belongs to us only by chance, but has an eternal destiny; beyond death too, the Ego will be presented before God in a new corporeality. The body is thus not an outward vessel, perhaps even prison, as Hellenism conceived it, but is an essential part of us. Man, seen from God's point of view, is an undivided whole, body, soul and spirit. Now, nobody can enter upon the bodily bond as something merely external and casual: it is a coming to one another of persons, and is given its dignity and consecration by the personal obligation to faithfulness. For marriage means that two human beings bind themselves together with their whole being, to belong to each other with body and soul. Hence there necessarily follows the unity and the indissolubility of marriage. This new conception of the body, and its significance for the sexual relationship, has been emphasized

with especial distinctness, and given its true value as against Hellenism, by the Apostle Paul himself. It was he who saw the bodily side of marriage as an obligation before God : " The wife hath not power of her own body, but the husband : and likewise also the husband hath not power of his own body, but the wife " (I Cor. vii., 4.). And it was he also who spoke the great word concerning the sanctification of the one partner by the other : " For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband : else were your children unclean ; but now are they holy " (I Cor. vii., 4). So deep does this connection go that if the one partner stands in the faith, the other is included along with him through him, and drawn along with him into the presence of God.

As a vessel which is an essential part of our life, the body is the temple of the Holy Ghost, Who desires to take up His abode in us ; and this temple must not be stained. The Christian is called to purity and chastity. If Hellenism regarded the body with such indifference that from one particular aspect even impurity could be accounted of no consequence, now the new attitude is expressed thus : " What ? know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own ? For ye are bought with a price : therefore glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's " (I Cor. vi., 19-20). God desires to be praised, not only by our soul and our inner life, but also by our bodily life. Sexual life too, that portion of our being most deeply stamped by sin, is given the great destiny of ministering to the glory of God : " And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly ; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ " (I Thess. v., 23). Upon this basis is set up the demand for unconditional chastity, which is very closely connected with the view of marriage as a whole : " But I say unto you, that whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart " (Matt. v., 28). From the New Testament view-point, sexual intercourse both before marriage and outside marriage is repudiated with a holy seriousness,

not because of a small-minded asceticism, but because of the depth and greatness of the matter. Whoever stands before God with his whole life, and knows that every one of the impulses of his life belongs to Him, cannot treat sensual desire and sexual intercourse as an exception, as something which is indifferent, for which he undertakes no responsibility; he regards himself as being subject to a holy obligation in this area also.

The Eschatological View of Marriage

The third factor which transvaluates the view of marriage is the eschatological attitude of the Early Church. The prospect of the Return of Christ gives it a new view of the values and the ties of this world. Every order of this world is transitory; no relation of life, accordingly, possesses ultimate validity in itself. An ultimate thing, the Kingdom of God, towers above everything else. It is coming, and will be perfected with the Coming of Jesus. To serve that Kingdom is the ultimate and highest concern; and that can be fulfilled outside marriage as well as within marriage. Indeed, from this point of view marriage can even be regarded as a hindrance, if it results in a too strong chain tying us to earthly reality. Measured by human standards, marriage will always be regarded as an absolute value, because of its generative significance and because of the personal happiness it gives, and the unmarried state will always seem crippledom. Here, however, there arises an entirely new and different attitude. The unmarried state is another way, another form of life, which possesses a full and complete content of its own. Jesus speaks of this new insight as a mystery: "But he said unto them, All men cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is given. For there are some eunuchs, which were so born from their mother's womb: and there are some eunuchs, which were made eunuchs of men: and there be eunuchs, which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it" (Matt. xix., 11-12).

This observation gives the unmarried man, and especially the virgin woman, a new dignity, and gives their life a new

content. On the ground of the Early Church, woman has her place beside man as a disciple of Jesus; she receives an office, has her place as co-worker, fellow-struggler in the Church front, in the *ecclesia*. And there is more room for that office in the life of the virgin and the widow than in that of the married woman. A new situation of man and woman side by side arises from that fact. On the basis of spiritual gifts and calling, ministries are assigned to both; and their destiny of mutual completion is thus given a new significance. Through the spiritual gifts, indeed, woman's special powers are awakened, and taken by God into His service. As woman stands beside man with fully-valid responsibility, she occupies a place which brings her to his side in a different way from the conjugal tie. The Early Church knew at this point that the special character of the sex as created must not be tampered with in this new freedom. It consciously guarded against the masculinization of woman. That is expressed in the customs of the time, in the admonition that the woman is not to lay aside the veil which conceals her, — an indication of the chastity and reserve of truly womanly service. That which is "womanly" is determined much more by *how* she carries out her ministry than by *what* it is. — Here we have a glimpse of the wealth of tension of the Early Christian message, which on the one hand emphasizes with a new and quite unheard-of energy the all-embracing character of marriage obligation, and on the other hand affirms the unmarried state, and the side-by-side service of man and woman to the Church, to be a new and meaningful form of life.

Marriage has had the significance of a Divine order since the Creation; but its meaning was corrupted by the Fall, by sin, and is revealed again only through the Gospel. Only on the ground of the Church does one know again what God's design with marriage is. In the struggle upon which we are engaged today, the Biblical testimony to that Will of God acquires a heightened significance for us. If Liberalism made the rights of the individual its ultimate criterion and thus denied marriage, nowadays the generative task with its subordination of the individual to the whole is being placed

above everything and endowed with absolute significance. This swing of the pendulum makes it especially clear how lacking in guidance man on his own account is in relation to sexual life.

The Word of the Bible speaks of sin and of the new freedom into which we are called. That Word can be appropriated only by faith ; and no one can fulfil the new Commandment of himself. The relation of the sexes is the area of life which most of all has been darkened by sin. It may, if it be lived in faith, become a state where the partners are tested and sanctified. Luther, speaking of the Marriage at Cana in a sermon on marriage, said this : " Only have a care that thou hast Christ by thee and art not Godless ; then He will make wine from water and bless thy state ".

The Meaning of Sex

W. A. VISSER 'T HOOFT

We are living in a time of such moral disarray and such uncertainty in the sexual order that we must occupy ourselves with the foundations and with nothing but the foundations. When a house has fallen down, we discuss, not how to furnish the new house, but how to give it more solid foundations. We are exactly in that situation. I do not say that in its actions our generation is very much more immoral than others. That is difficult to know and impossible to prove. I assert simply that we no longer have at our disposal such norms or convictions as might enable us to decide between good and evil in sexual life and might direct us in our actions and our decisions. When our forebears sinned in this realm, they knew it ; but when we sin, we are not even certain that we are sinning. And conversely, when our forebears obeyed the Will of God, they knew it ; but when we desire to obey His Will, we remain in uncertainty as to its *content*. That is why we must begin again at the

beginning and seek an answer to the fundamental question : *What is the meaning of sexual life ?* The task of seeking an answer to that question has a different kind of importance from the task of giving casuistical counsels, however practical these may be. In sexual life, as in the whole of life, the only way of avoiding " the great fall " is to build " upon the rock ".

Three Answers to our Question

Leaving aside details and shades of opinion, we may say that three great answers are being given in our time to the question which concerns us here. They are the *moralist* answer, the *vitalist* answer, and the *Biblical* answer.

Moralism, which is a kind of alloy of secularized Christianity and *bourgeois* utilitarianism, and which unfortunately still exercises a great influence in our Protestant circles, considers sexual life in itself as a dangerous reality which must be subdued and controlled by a system of moral principles. It regards the sexual force as a turbulent stream which must be either canalized or banked up in order to keep it from causing considerable damage. That is why moralism formulates rules, some borrowed from the Biblical Revelation, others borrowed from *bourgeois* convention, and demands their strict observance. Sexual sin is, for it, anything that runs counter to its system of principles. In return, anything that is not forbidden by that system is allowable. And since it is interested principally in the external social order, in the consequences of acts rather than in the acts themselves or in their intention, it goes so far as to judge harshly everything that constitutes an open infringement of the established order, and to let pass those sins which have no unfortunate results for society. We all know how it is possible to find in the same family and in the same person an extraordinarily strict code regarding the duties of woman before and after marriage and a total indifference regarding the sexual life of man. That is naturally a decadence of moralism, but a decadence which it is not difficult to explain, because principles, systems and norms are at bottom always subject to the will of man. He can adapt them as he chooses. Thus his principles, far from being eternal verities, become a projection of human egoism

by which the stronger protects himself against the weaker. And the moralism which issued from an idealism degenerates until it becomes a tyrannical conventionalism.

It is against that tyranny that all those are rising up today who believe that sexual life has a meaning in itself, and that the expression of that vital force is vastly more important than the maintenance of principles. The advocates of this vitalism, that is to say, of the primacy of life over morals, have dominated modern literature and revolutionized our conceptions of sexual life. "We are sacrificing truth, that is to say sincerity, to continuity, to purity of line", said André Gide; and he has become the chief of a whole school of novelists and of "immoralists" who had as their motto: "Let us go right to the end of ourselves". We know that much of our modern psychology, and especially psychoanalysis in the orthodox edition of Freud, has preached a similar gospel. Sexual life is considered as a natural force which should be accepted and which should be allowed to express itself fully. In such a novelist as D. H. Lawrence, we find even a kind of adoration of the sexual instinct. In others, especially in the writers of the post-War generation, we find on the contrary a kind of disillusioned realism which looks upon sexual life as a very far from glorious but inevitable and irrepressible instinct.

That reaction was inevitable. And in a certain sense it has been useful. It was necessary to demonstrate the hypocrisy, the shallowness, the tyrannical character of moralism. But reaction is not enough. In preaching the absolute autonomy of sexual life, in refusing all external control, the vitalist tendency has isolated the sexual element from life as a whole, and had therefore either to divinize it or to consider it as a purely physical phenomenon. The position that sexual life has no other sense than that which it bears in itself, and that the end of sexual life is nothing but the expression of an instinct, becomes finally a non-sense, an empty truth, and leads to an inflation of sexual values. That which has no transcendent sense has no sense at all.

The Biblical conception of sexual life has something in common both with moralism and with vitalism. Like

moralism, it maintains that sexual life is not autonomous, that it is subject to a reality which surpasses it. Like vitalism, it affirms that it is not external principles but internal sincerity that matters. But at the same time it is opposed to these other replies. Moralism is wrong in demanding an obedience to impersonal principles instead of a concrete obedience to a personal God. It preaches a Law instead of a Gospel, that is to say, it believes that man can save himself by applying external rules ; whereas the Bible offers us a pardon and a renewal which are gifts of God. But the purely biological conception is wrong in denying the bond which exists between God and His Creation, that is, the theonomy of the whole of life. Instead of saying, like St. Augustine : " Love God and do what you like ", it forgets the essential thing and says only : " Do what you like ".

Sexual life does not exist only to be repressed ; it has a *positive* meaning. The Bible has nothing to do with those philosophies which make an absolute distinction between the spiritual and the corporeal, between God and Nature. This instinct is part of the Creation of God, and must be used to His glory. But, like everything human, this instinct is corrupted by sin. It is not good in itself ; it must be renewed, re-directed, sanctified.

What we have just said is pretty generally recognized by Christians ; but it may reasonably be asked if that is enough to live by. That the aim of sexual life is the glory of God — that is all very well ; but what does it mean concretely ? Happily, the Bible tells us more about it than that. It does not give us a code of principles, as moralism would like, but it does better ; it gives, in the form of history and of commandments, the witness of men to whom God has revealed His Will, and it gives above all the words and the example of Him Who is *the* Revelation. It does not confront us with absolute law, because we live, not under the law, but under grace. The Will of God is ultimately unforeseeable and unique, and can be known only by the act of faith. But all the content of the Bible : history, example, exhortation, commandment, parable, retains none the less its immense importance. It gives us sign-posts which show us in what direction we

must search in order to find the particular Will of God for us. It is the school where we learn how God acts and the way in which He guides us. It is the half-open door through which we can descry the Kingdom where God reigns.

The Bible shows us that the great facts of sexual life — the difference of the sexes, marriage, the sexual instinct — acquire a quite special significance as soon as we see them from the point of view of the Divine work of Creation and Redemption. Thus it gives us what we need to find our way in the chaos of the customs and sexual opinions of our time.

The Difference of the Sexes

Why two sexes? The first two chapters of the Bible give a clear answer. In the first chapter of Genesis we read : “ God created man in His own image ; . . . male and female created He them ”. So we see at the very start that the difference of the sexes is fundamental and not only accidental. It is an order of creation ; God *willed* the difference. It does not exist simply because of procreation ; it has a value in itself, since it is willed by God.

We see the true meaning of the difference of the sexes still more clearly in the second chapter. There we must follow modern translations in order to understand the full content of the Biblical Message. “ And the Lord God said : it is not good that the man should be alone ; I will make him a help as his *vis-à-vis*.” This translation, which renders the true meaning of the Hebrew *kenegdo*, shows us *why* God wills the two sexes. Man has need of a neighbour. Even before the Fall, the “ I ” has need of a “ Thou ” on its own level. The existence of *the other* in the human order is for him a reminder or a symbol of the existence of the Other in the Divine order. And that other must be sufficiently like him for communion to be possible, but sufficiently different for him to find in him or her a *vis-à-vis*, a being to whom he is bound by its likeness and its unlikeness to him, a being who completes him and whom he completes since they represent together and not in isolation the image of God.

That order of creation remains in force after the Fall.

But that does not mean that men and women accept it and live by it. On the contrary, they tend to live for themselves, or to dominate and exploit the other sex. They no longer know that they exist only the one for the other and the one by the other. They declare themselves independent. And so we see the appearance of masculinism, which treats woman, not as the neighbour, the thou, the *vis-à-vis*, but as the "stranger", as a thing, as a slave; and later we see the development of feminism, a reaction which is natural but also sterile, and which leads only to another separation of that which God has joined.

The Biblical message is that God wills that the life of man should be lived in relation with woman and that the life of woman should be lived in relation with man. Human life is human only in that mutuality, that relation, that polarity. I speak, not yet of marriage, but of life in general. Even before marriage, even in the life of those who do not marry, that order is valid. It is always a sin to live as if the other sex did not exist. It is also a sin not to take seriously one's quality as man or as woman. The equalitarianism which desires to level out the true differences, and the separatism which sees only the difference and not the relation, are equally condemned by the Bible.

It is true that the Bible recognizes a kind of hierarchy in which man comes before woman. St. Paul speaks in several passages of the authority of man over woman. But if I rightly understand the thought of St. Paul, this is a question, not of a reversal of the order of mutuality, but rather of its confirmation. This authority of man is not an arbitrary authority, but a special responsibility before God. For St. Paul makes it very clear that man is just as dependent upon woman as woman is upon man. In other words, the authority of man over woman cannot be anything else than the responsibility which is given along with the difference of the sexes, for instance by the fact that man is physically the stronger. And again, that authority is only provisional, that is to say, an order in and for the present world. In Christ, there is neither male nor female. In the Kingdom itself there exist only saved beings

who have no longer any need of the orders of the fallen world.

What does all the Biblical teaching mean practically? The Bible does not wish us to isolate ourselves from each other, or to exclude from our life the influence of the other sex. We must admit our need of being completed and (according to the Biblical expression) of letting ourselves be *helped* by the other sex. We must recognize the right to existence of the other sex, and not consider it as an object of pleasure or exploitation. We must also recognize the right and the duty of the other sex to be different, and not force it to adopt itself unilaterally to its *vis-à-vis*. We must accept the limitations implied in belonging to a sex. (The effeminate man and the masculine woman are equally absurd.) We must accept the special responsibilities of our sex, which means for man, that of a relative authority over woman, and for woman, that of being a help for man.

Marriage

According to the Bible, marriage is the clearest expression of the Divine intention that man and woman must live the one for the other. In the one word which we have from Him on this subject, Jesus takes His stand on the two Creation narratives and applies them directly to marriage. It is therefore in marriage that we find the deepest answer to the question : Why two sexes ?

For marriage according to the Bible is nothing less than the physical and spiritual union of two persons who desire to remain united for life. The second chapter of Genesis says : " They shall be one flesh ", which means : They shall be only one being, *they shall have only one life* ; for the word " flesh " in the Bible means simply " human life " and not only physical or sexual life in the narrower sense of the term. That is why St. Paul can apply this word from Genesis to Christ and His Church. It is a question of a total union, without reserve, in which one gives all to receive all. The aim of marriage is a community of life of such intimacy and such power that the two human beings concerned become literally inseparable. Thus marriage has in one sense

certainly its aim and its *raison d'être* in itself. That is to say, not that marriage must not serve the glory of God, but that it is necessary to enter into marriage without mental reservation, without any other motive than the desire to be united with a certain other person. The union will be total, the flesh will be one, only if one seeks the "thou" and only the "thou".

For the same reason, true marriage is indissoluble. In an authentic marriage — union of body, soul and spirit — there is a bond for the whole of life. Provisional or temporary marriage is not marriage at all, but a caricature of the Biblical conception of marriage. One can give part of oneself and remain free; one cannot give oneself totally and take up one's liberty again as if nothing had happened.¹ One of the Biblical words for divorce is *apostasy*. One understands that in the light of Jesus' word: "What God hath joined, let not man put asunder".

Such is the order of God. Such was marriage according to the word of Jesus: "in the beginning", that is, before the Fall. Since then, men have made it something quite different: a legal contract, an institution for their pleasure or their comfort, a temporary relation. But Jesus comes to confirm the authority of the original order. Those who desire to enter into His Kingdom will recognize no other marriage than the totalitarian marriage. It is true that there are several words of Jesus and of St. Paul which seem to contain a warning against marriage rather than a confirmation of marriage; but that implies, not a *different* conception of marriage, but rather a *condition*, a *reservation*. Marriage belongs to this world; and this world will pass. There are times, there are situations in which it is better not to be married, in order to be completely available for the service of God. But that commandment for the eschatological moment and for exceptional service is not given to most of us. There are some like St. Paul, who have received the vocation to

¹ "To give the pledge and yet be pined
That a pledge should have force to bind;
This, O Soul, too often still
Is the recreance of thy Will."

Francis Thompson.

remain celibate, but for the rest of us the other truth remains valid : " It is not good that the man should be alone ".

This Biblical conception of marriage is certainly the highest, the truest — but can it mean anything for us, poor human beings, who are incapable of realizing it in our uncertainty and our egoism ? The truth is that this Biblical marriage does not exist, since we never manage to give ourselves completely. Where is the man who gives himself without reserve to his wife ? Where is the woman who gives herself without reserve to her husband ? Where is that absolute unity which can be compared with the union of Christ with His Church ? But if this is so, how can we organize our life according to such a conception, which surpasses us and which does not seem to take account of the reality of our life ?

The reply to all these questions is that marriage is an *order of God*, that is an intention, a commandment and a gift of God. We are certainly judged by such an order. But we are at the same time assisted and upheld by it, since it is a grace of God, a Divine intervention into our life, an organization by God of our disorder. Those who have entered into marriage as believers, who believe that their union is given them by God, discover that it is precisely the intransigence of the order of God which helps them to maintain and to deepen their marriage. When they begin to lose courage, when they no longer find in themselves the power to elevate their marriage, to make it correspond with the intention of God and their own hopes, it is said to them : " Faithful is He that calleth you, who also will do it ". Karl Barth has written : " One can say of the order of marriage, as of all the orders of God, what the Gospel says in speaking of the sun and the rain which God gives to the just and the unjust : the order exists for the good and the bad, it represents a *question*, but also a *reply*. One cannot so easily escape from it and feel oneself shielded from its judgment by taking refuge in a marriage which one considers as absolutely irreproachable and intact. But it signifies also : support, consolation, confirmation and direction." That is an extraordinarily practical truth, more practical than the most detailed counsels

concerning the psychological or physiological errors which must be avoided.

Here it becomes clearer than in any other realm of life that the life lived before God is radically different from that lived on a purely human level. Christian marriage has only the name in common with the marriage described in our novels or our books on sexology. The difference is not that Christians do not know the difficulties, the tragedies, the almost impossibility of true marriage, but that they do not remain alone, that in their marriage there is a third party, who helps them. For that same reason it is impossible to exaggerate the importance of common prayer in marriage or in the preparation for marriage.

The Sexual Instinct

We speak of the sexual instinct only in the third place, and after having spoken of the Christian conception of the difference between the sexes and of marriage. For its place is, or rather ought to be, a subordinate place. Is that to say that the sexual instinct is of an inferior order? Not at all. The Bible does not fall into the error of Manichaeism, which identifies sin with the material and the corporeal, or into the error of moralism, which sees in the sexual instinct only a force to combat or to tame. What the Bible does is to give it a positive aim, but an aim which makes it subservient to the order of God as a whole.

The sexual instinct in itself is neither bad nor sinful. It is simply "flesh"; and flesh means, as we have already seen, the "stuff" of human life. The central fact of the Revelation: that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh, well shows that the flesh in itself is not sinful. That flesh, that organism of human functions and capacities, has been created by God for His service. Similarly the sexual instinct is a function by which man becomes capable of realizing the Divine plan as regards the relation of man and woman. It is not an end in itself; it is not the master; it does not have (as vitalism would claim) the right to dominate and to direct; it is rather a servant; it must be envisaged within the great perspective of the creative intentions of God.

But the flesh no longer exists in its purity, in its submission to God. It desires to use its functions for its own glory. So the sexual instinct, like all the other functions, becomes the servant of another master. It desires to serve rebellious man, egoistical man. But since he is a weak master and the sexual instinct is strong, what happens in reality is that that instinct begins to isolate itself from the other functions and to dominate the situation.

So the order of God has been reversed. That which ought to serve the glory of God and the communion of men becomes an anarchical force, a force which separates more than it unites, and which obsesses us instead of liberating us. Thus one understands why so many men and women have been led to curse this tyrannical master which desires to make them its slaves. One understands why the moralists have tried to combat it and force it to obey the laws necessary to a well-ordered human life. But one sees clearly also that their efforts must remain vain. The true tyrant accepts no law; the only thing to do is to deprive him of power and constrain him to live as a simple citizen who must obey. And for that he needs, not a law, but a master stronger than himself.

That is what the Bible tells us in teaching that by the law, that is to say, by the application of principles, by canalization, or by repression pure and simple, we simply sink deeper and deeper in the morass. What have we gained if, while our actions become a little less anarchical and a little more conventional, our inner life, conscious and unconscious, is more than ever empoisoned by the tyranny of sex? For the Bible, the question is not only what we *do*, but what we *are*. Jesus judges us just as much by our intentions as by our acts. "Whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart." The tragedy of our sexual life consists precisely in the fact that we lust or *covet*, that is to say that our *hearts* allow themselves to be directed by the instinct, that we leave to it the direction and the control of our life. A revolution is required. It is necessary that another master should take the thing in hand. That is the message of the Bible. That master is the Spirit of God, that is to say, God acting, Christ living. "Walk in the

Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the desires of the flesh." It is not said that those who walk in the Spirit shall no longer have any flesh, no longer have any sexual instinct. But they will no longer fulfil *its* desires. That is to say, their flesh, their human nature, their instincts will fulfil the desires of *another*. Their sexuality will be a sexuality directed towards the original aim — that of deep union with another being given by God.

But if God does not give us, or does not yet give us, that union, — if we remain solitary, within or without marriage, and all our physical being calls for the fulfilment of its desire ? Then we must accept that trial and bear it in prayer and conflict, trying to understand the gracious intention of God which is the hidden meaning of every trial, recognizing the holiness of the commandment even if we transgress it, and knowing that we receive pardon from God only if we confess our sin before Him. There is only one thing more serious than sin ; that is the hardness of heart which justifies itself by denying the validity of the Divine commandment. What strikes us in the world of the Bible is that we meet many sinners there, a great number also who have sinned against the order of God in sexual life, but that we find nobody who does not confess his sin before God.

Is this a *laissez-faire* morality ? To those who know nothing of what the Holiness of God and the reality of sin mean to the Christian, it may well seem to be so. But to the others, to those who have come face to face with God, it is clear that this is the only way out of the chaos in their own hearts and in the world.

Paradise Lost

SUZANNE DE DIETRICH

On the threshold of both the Testaments we find a woman. The first yields freely to the suggestion of the Evil One and becomes instrumental in the Fall of mankind; the second yields freely to the calling of God and becomes instrumental in the salvation of mankind by giving birth to the Saviour of the world. Those who claim that the Bible pays little attention to womanhood seem to have overlooked the deep significance of these two stories. Every woman should keep both these figures in mind when she tries to decipher the mystery of her calling.

I say that both Eve and Mary yield *freely* to the calling which comes to them. They are left alone to face both the Tempter and the Angel. Man may indeed control the whole of her outward life; but in her relation to God — and to the Devil — woman, like man, has in the last resort to make her own decision; no one else can sell or save her soul. At the Last Day, she will have to answer for herself. And to this responsibility for her own soul the Bible adds another: it stresses the power woman has to carry man with her, for good or for ill.

The Serpent was wise: he very well knew that if he could win Eve, he would get Adam too. Woman has often been made responsible for the curse which through her disobedience came upon mankind. One might answer that to conquer Eve it needed the Devil's skill; to defeat man, a woman's skill was enough! But that would be idle talk.

Every woman knows herself to be a daughter of Eve; every woman has deeply rooted in her a longing for the tree of the knowledge of good and evil; every woman knows, too, her secret power over man, and is tempted to abuse it. The tragedy of the Garden of Eden is one of broken relationship. Man and woman were made for true — truthful — companion-

ship. But now, as a direct consequence of their common breaking away from God, there is distrust between them. — In a community where mutual trust exists no longer, some kind of authority, some hierarchy is needed. Man will dominate woman; but woman knows that if she is patient and clever enough, the time will come when Samson will fall asleep and Delilah be able to cut his hair. And man knows that woman knows his weak spots, and hates her for it; while she hates him for being the stronger, and still more for being the weaker (for he is both!).

As soon as they had eaten of the fruit of knowledge, Adam and Eve saw that they were naked, and felt ashamed of it, and ran away to hide. That hiding-party has gone on ever since: hiding from God, hiding from ourselves, hiding from each other, consciously and unconsciously, willingly and unwillingly.

Some people may challenge this statement because they live on the surface of their own being and are content with "surface relationships" with others. But the truer and deeper the relationship we try to build up, the truer and deeper the knowledge of our own self, the more we suffer from this "unknown" and "unreachable" element in the other. A premature truthfulness shown to one who was not ready for it has broken more than one beautiful relationship. We have to hide, because we dare not disclose the nakedness of our being, even to our nearest and dearest (and sometimes even less to them than to others).

The relation between men and women has not to be "improved"; it has to be restored and saved like everything in human life. Do we believe in the redemptive power of Christ in this realm as in all others?

What bearing has the fact of the Cross on this relationship? In the light of the Cross we see ourselves as we are in the nakedness of our being; the light which shines on us from *there* allows of no more hiding, even from ourselves. The Spirit of God is called the Spirit of truth; His work is first of all to tear away all the clever wrappings in which we have clad our own soul; poor we are and poor we must agree to stand. But he who has come to know his own nakedness, and has

been accepted by God as he is, is ready to accept the other, — to face the truth of the other inasmuch as it is revealed to him, — to face everything — even the other's remaining untruthfulness. For who can ever claim to have gone right to the bottom of his own heart ?

It is true of all deep human relationship that we crave for "oneness" in spirit and in truth and can never fully attain it in our earthly life. The gift of insight has been bestowed on human love ; and yet there is a limit beyond which even the deepest love cannot go. We have to accept each other "in faith", each one knowing that God's Hand is on the other, reaching out where we cannot. The state in which each soul was crystal-clear to the other is paradise lost, and will be fully regained only in the Kingdom of heaven. But on earth there can be a simple and truthful companionship of the "poor in spirit", who together live in and through God's forgiveness, and rely not on their own but on God's truthfulness.

Real companionship means each one understanding and accepting the calling of the other, and helping that other towards its realization. The more different we are, the more insight (and insight means perhaps a certain gift of "imaginative" love!), faith and patience are needed.

Why is it that in the realm of friendship we find more of a simple straightforward mutual trust amongst men sharing the same faith and the same goal, than amongst women ? Some may challenge my statement ; generalizations are always dangerous ; yet I believe the question to be a real one and one to which women might well give some thought. Is it that we are more "personal" in everything we do ? Is it that we tend to be exclusive in friendship as we are in love ? Is it that the complexity of our being, which makes every woman a riddle even for the man who loves her, is somewhat of a riddle even to ourselves and makes simple mutual trust more difficult ? Is it that we have awakened only recently to a type of co-operation in thought and action which men have known for centuries ?

Women are capable of more selflessness than men ; selfless giving has been made by the Creator the very essence of

motherhood ; a woman can be utterly selfless where the man whom she loves is concerned. In her working relationships a woman will readily accept the leadership of men whose technical ability or intellectual superiority she acknowledges. And the same woman may start being "personal" and oversensitive where other women are concerned. That is part of Eve's tragedy and struggle, of her longing for the lost partnership ; it is the secret complex from which she has to be redeemed. And the aggressively self-assertive woman suffers no less from that complex than the all-too-submissive woman of old.

All men need "something" to live for ; but we women need "someone" to give ourselves to, some one who will need us. And this is the unredeemed element of selfseeking in our apparent selflessness.

Man's selfishness takes a much cruder and more naïve form. He has for centuries taken it for granted that he should be the ruler and master, the centre around which the whole household should gravitate. When Paul tells the husband that he should love his wife as Christ loves the Church, he brings an utterly new conception into the ancient world. — Christlike love means selfless giving ; it always carries with it an element of vicarious suffering, of taking upon us the other's burden. It means serving instead of dominating, stooping down willingly to help, not from above, not from without, but if I may say so "from within". It means leading, but leading in and through the bands of love. Only in togetherness will men and women reach "fullness of life".

Selfless obedience was the way of Mary, the Handmaiden of the Lord. And she has been put before our eyes, ever since, as embodying the ideal of womanhood. But selfless obedience is also the way of the Son of Man. There is for both man and woman only one path to life. "For whosoever will save his life shall lose it : and whosoever will lose his life for my sake shall find it." "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone : but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit."

Eve, Where Art Thou ?

HENRIETTE BODDAERT

Do Men and Women believe in each other ?

The presupposition of all knowledge is faith ; and that is also true of the knowledge that man and woman should have of one another. In order to know somebody, one must first accept the fact that he exists. And that not as an idea, an image or a type, but as a *person*, i.e. a responsible individual.

Does woman really accept man's existence ? — Just as in former times she obeyed him, today she imitates him without criticism, that is, she takes him for granted. But that is not taking him seriously as a person ; it is taking him merely as an abstract norm. Her attitude expresses, not faith but credulity.

Man is no more a norm for humanity than woman is. Man and woman together constitute the human being. Psychologists, philosophers and theologians today unite in stressing this age-old truth. Jung, Maeder, Schmitz, Künkel, Esther Harding and others point out that humanity stagnates if man and woman do not develop in correlation, that woman's emancipation will find its true sense and right orientation only after she has found a new psychological relatedness to man, and that man cannot rise to a higher level of consciousness without woman's spiritual development. And this means that woman must come to her own, literally so. For man has become to her an abstract norm not only in the outer world, but for her inner life as well. Subconsciously he is the dictator of her soul and her spirit. This may lead to psychological and even to physiological disturbances, such as appear today.

But does man believe in the existence of woman ? In spite of the progress which has been made in adding new types of women to those already known, such as the typist, the air-woman, etc., one cannot say that much has changed since the

first feminist in England began her struggle against the principle of law : "Woman is dead". A unilateral masculine psychology is more than ever dominating the world and repressing by its mere existence any authentic expression of the feminine soul. It is true that voices are heard everywhere complaining that there is a lack of feminine atmosphere in the world, and that no feminine form of existence has as yet found its representation on earth. But there is no serious demand for woman's existence as such. Her dubious position may be compared with an actual economic problem. Let us assume that a country produces much wheat and is rich in petrol. A crisis of some duration breaks out, so that neither corn nor petrol can be exported. Although starvation rages in many lands, the corn must be burnt as superfluous and the borings of the oil springs must be stopped. The attempt is made to utilize them for other industrial purposes, but this procedure appears too costly. The position of woman is a similar one. She is forbidden to export her gifts and possibilities ; the former must be destroyed, the latter suppressed. "Why", says man, "can she not employ her corn as a children's plaything, and why does she not use her oil as wax for her household?" Yes, why not? Are not these honourable employments? Certainly : but woman is no magician.

In human nature there are forces which must find their own way of expression ; if that way is forbidden them, evidence is given of an astonishing lack of respect for life ; and that always avenges itself. It is maintained that the typical contribution which woman makes is an anonymous one, which influences the community in an invisible way, through the family and other channels. But, if that is true, if that *can* be true in a world which is predominantly masculine, this influence is very defective today. An example is the fact that, while in modern nations everywhere the sacredness of motherhood is exalted in splendid speeches, talk about crisis, unemployment, poison-gas and bacterial warfare constitutes woman's daily bread. If those speeches go on and on long enough, woman might decide to resort to conscientious objection. She might thus make clear that she is not a sacred producing machine, but a responsible human

being. The fact that this thought does not occur to man anywhere shows how little he believes in the existence of woman as a person.

This attitude of credulity on the woman's side and incredulity on the man's side as to each other's existence creates the worst conditions possible for mutual understanding. It is the basis of all the misunderstandings and conflicts of the sexes with one another, the consequences of which are so obvious today.

The Unipolarity of Man

The indifference towards the individual development of woman, who is desperately seeking her own destiny and can hardly do without man's help in that work, has its cause in the unbelief of man with regard to the existence of a second pole. And that unbelief rests upon the unconscious unipolarity of man.

Gottfried Eberz¹ says in his violent way :

"The ruling sex regards itself in its isolation as the meaning of life, and produces from the instinct of its will to power the myth of its election and its infallibility. It is the Narcissism of the uni-sexual nature." And he continues : "Let woman make no mistake : she has emancipated herself to apparent independence of the individual man, only to deliver herself into the power of the anonymous collectivity of men." Eberz then asserts that man seeks in two ways to destroy feminine individuality ; first by the suppression of the sub- and supraconscious life which disturbs him but is natural to her, and secondly by sexualizing her.

Eberz is right. Man understands life by mastering it ; and to that end he must divide it. "*Divide et impera*" is his principle. But woman understands life by fellowship with it. Her principle is to render this fellowship secure. It follows from the nature of the masculine principle that for him these two principles must exclude one another, whereas it follows

¹ *Vom Aufgang und Niedergang des männlichen Weltalters* (The Rise and Fall of the Masculine Age). Bergstadtverlag, Breslau.

on the contrary from the nature of the feminine principle that it appears to her that these two principles can very well be complementary to one another. But because man does not recognize the existence of that which he does not know how to master, woman must, in order to understand man and enter into community with him, make his principle her own.

Schmitz¹ says : " The masculine principle is not at all the stronger principle in itself ; it is so only in man ; the feminine principle gives strength to woman ". But it seems to me that it might also be said that in woman her strength becomes weakness to the extent to which her psychical plasticity enables her to think according to the masculine principle. And because man is not capable of judging and estimating her according to her own nature, she suffers from a serious frustration.

Man's case is the contrary : his weakness is his strength. As he is incapable of grasping other categories than his own, it is for him a matter of course that he should set them up as norms and impose them on the whole world.

In fact, when a man asserts that a woman's conclusion is illogical, it is often just then that she is true to her own principle. But then she is charged with lack of objectivity. What is objectivity, however ? May it not ultimately be masculine subjectivity, which declares itself holy and unimpeachable in such a way that even God can penetrate it no longer ? Man desires to think objectively, observe objectively and even believe objectively ! But when the great question is put to Adam : " Where art thou ? " is he then to give a merely objective reply ?

Eberz spoke of the sexualization of woman as the second " method " of destroying feminine individuality.

Even if sexuality represents a branch of interesting and useful study, it is yet still more a mystery. Nobody will ever succeed by the vivisection of love in disclosing its secret. When one reads the works of those who plead for the right of woman to a " normal " sexual life, one involuntarily asks

¹ *Tragikomödie der Geschlechter* (Tragi-comedy of the Sexes), S. 25. Carl Hauser Verlag, München.

what are the presuppositions upon which they base this undiscussable norm. Sexuality loses its meaning as soon as it is no longer anything but a concession to the physical needs of man and woman, for then there happens the exact reverse of what ought to happen : there arises a unisexual masculine Narcissism over against a unisexual feminine Narcissism. It is clear that that has, at least for woman, the consequence of a desperate isolation, and lames or kills her spontaneous powers.

In this area also, woman must come to herself. She ought to make a little less merry over so-called "romantic love"; and she ought to observe modern reality somewhat more intensely and more closely. Then she would perhaps discover that there too she is in process of keeping silent concerning things which she might say and delivering herself up to things which her nature denies. In all this there is much false shame; and it should never be forgotten that man's lack of understanding for the feminine Eros arises to a great extent from a despal of certain elements in himself which are badly developed, and the projection of which into the external world does not always harmonize with reality. It is the feminine element in the subconsciousness of man which he simultaneously despises and fears. A trained eye can usually recognize at once the stage of development of these elements in a man by means of the opinion he has of women. In this area, the emancipation of *man* is urgently necessary. For his primitiveness is a serious hindrance, not only to the further development of woman, but also to his own development. Here man must transform himself according to the development of woman, as Dr. Maeder¹ says, so that the humanization of man and woman may be realized.

The Bipolarity of Love

Romantic love is really a contradiction in itself. For love, it is a life-and-death question whether both the *realities* of man and of woman are recognized or not. This is *the* area where unipolarity is impossible. Love penetrates the reality

¹ *Das Ehebuch* (The Marriage Book): "*Ehe und Selbstentwicklung*" (Marriage and Self-development), S. 380.

of another being, accepts and endures what it finds there, and, catching it up out of its isolation, sets it free for a greater reality wherein both realities are present. But the "realists" recognize only their own reality; and woe to those who must live in its shadow: they are forced to maintain themselves by the poor light of their own loneliness.

In true love, the two poles become conscious of their origin in the one Pole which unites them separately. Therefore there is no love without faith. It is like a triangle: where God is the goal, the point of the triangle, man and woman are rightly polarized. Faith in God is the presupposition of faith in one another. It is a threefold dynamic connection.

Nobody has expressed this truth better than Wilhelm Vischer¹: "The man whose nearest relation is God may and must become neighbour to a fellow-creature without his nearest relation to God being disturbed thereby: on the contrary, in such a way that the love to the fellow-creature flows out of the love of God, and the one human being becomes for the other the pure mirror in which the heart enkindled by the love of God reflects itself. One might say: so does the moon circle round the earth and the earth at the same time round the sun in one and the same motion and power, in the rays and reflection of the same sunlight. But the miracle of the redoubling of the One Love is without compare. Only one who is his equal can man love as himself."

That is the love which God has provided for His creatures; and it alone is worthy of them. If anyone knows of this love, and it is not given him to realize it in this life — that suffering is cruel and incessant. It is nevertheless greater to make heroic efforts to prevent a great thing from being made small and conformed to the level upon which one must live. This dream should be kept pure; for it is true. Its truth can be attested by suffering also.

When people marry, they often have printed upon their cards: "The marriage blessing *will* be given . . ." What do we know of that? Does God bless us to order? — In view of the innumerable unhappy marriages and divorces,

¹ *Das Christuszeugnis des Alten Testaments* (The Old Testament Testimony to Christ), S. 69. Chr. Kaiser Verlag, München.

we know that that is not true. Certainly God does not bless our cheap views of life. So many marriages go wrong because the people in question begin their life in common powerfully illuminated in the sense of the sexologists instead of in the sense of mutual understanding. Yet faithfulness is a vague concept without such understanding. There is a faithfulness which is worse than adultery. That is faithfulness to the dead end of a marriage, faithfulness to the *status quo*. It is to be found where the man lives only for his work and his future and uses his marriage only for relaxation, perhaps giving in to all his wife's whims like an "ideal husband" provided that she leaves him in peace so far as her deeper wishes are concerned. The same is true of the faithfulness of the woman for whom the only meaning of marriage consists in motherhood, who sacrifices everything, her husband included, for her children, to the great misfortune of all. Examples might be multiplied; and in every single case the people concerned, even if they be the most model couple in the eyes of the world, are not really married.

The Church ought to be in a position to dissolve such caricatures of marriage. There are obviously people enough who know what marriage means but who, for psychological or other reasons, have to live like divorced people. Should they separate completely? It seems to me that that depends upon their faith. It may be that God will perform a miracle in order to unite them, or that He desires, for reasons which they will never know, that they should remain together. The one may even believe that in virtue of the faith of the other. Even if their difficulties were insurmountable, their remaining together would preserve its significance. It is possible that there is need in some cases of a martyr's faith; and that is not given to all. In any case, human beings do not among themselves have the right to thrust such demands upon one another. That is a question between the individual and God.

Is Man the Head of Woman?

Now the question arises quite of its own accord: How is the Christian to conceive of this whole problem?

To that question it may be answered in brief that God is

working through the Christian faith at a development for man and for woman, and that we must endeavour neither to hinder Him nor to out-run Him through indifference or unbelief.

In a conversation with Karl Barth, who believes he must hold fast the Pauline chain : God-Christ-Man-Woman, each link being the lord of the following one, and who sees therein an order which is given with the fact of Revelation, I said to him that I understood less and less how a Christian, even the most believing one, could accept that hierarchy. He remained silent for a moment, and then said gravely : " But do you not understand, then, that it means a heavy burden for us men ? "

I was really deeply touched ; for has it ever happened before that a Christian, that a man has witnessed in this way to his tragic situation ? But a little later I thought : No, no, that is not possible ! How could God, who knows human beings, knows them so well that He considered it necessary to sacrifice His only Son in order to save them, lay upon the one half of mankind through that Son a heavy burden upon which the salvation of the other half would to a great extent depend ?

Jesus Christ has borne all our burdens and overcome sin upon the Cross. And God will know that the Grand Inquisitors of this world take control of His Commands and, in conforming them to the laws of this world, transform them with ease into an order of *masculine* creation.

But if one thinks with Barth that it is necessary to accept that hierarchy, I see only one alternative :

Either this is a question of a teaching which is not self-evident, which has simply to be accepted as a mystery in the sense of Ephesians v. 32, where St. Paul says : " This is a great mystery : but I speak concerning Christ and the Church ". This text has always been treated as a platitude, and not at all as a mystery. But a mystery should be allowed to remain what it is meant to be : mystery.

Or this Revelation is given a content for real life : and then man does indeed find himself saddled with a heavy burden in relation to woman, a burden which must alter from the very foundation his attitude towards her. He is

the head of the woman, just as Christ is the Head of the man. Total self-sacrifice, absolute self-surrender, deep interest in everything connected with the spiritual life of woman should then become the basis of his attitude. I picture that to myself like the relation of the missionary to the natives. The missionary endeavours to penetrate into their world and learn their foreign language. He studies the nature of that tribe, in order to find the forms of expression peculiar to it through which he can bring home to it the truth of his faith. In short, he continually seeks for points of contact; and without doing violence to the truth, he avoids doing violence to the intellectual capacity of the people entrusted to him. A heavy burden, indeed.

On the other hand, the native, because of his situation and his different psychology, is a continual challenge to the missionary's superiority-complex, involuntary domineeringness and spiritual sclerosis.

In truth, the more one considers the matter, the more does it seem that it would have been a wise educational measure for God to make man the head of woman. But then man ought to be a real head, in complete humility before God, and then he ought to devote his life to that task.

So far as I know, the Church has attached her allegiance neither to the one view nor to the other; on the contrary, she has remained rather indefinite in her interpretation of this far-reaching Revelation. And when the world took possession of that Revelation in order to make it into a human *privilege*, she made no protest; she tried to shut her eyes, and so gave her support to the most complete arbitrariness and all imaginable abuses.

The Woman's Problem and the Man's Problem

Even today, few Christians are to be found who are interested in the "woman's problem". Usually it is put in the last place, after all the social, political and humanitarian problems. That is an error. For at the moment when the break between God and man took place, so also did the

break between Eve and Adam; and all the problems of humanity came only *after* that two-fold break.

I know men who, if they are obliged to touch upon the "woman's problem", emphasize the former word, in order to make it clear that this problem does not in any case concern *them*; and women who feel the mere existence of this problem as a personal insult. And are they not right? It is at the very least an absurdity that the world does not know what to do with one half of humanity. Is there any talk of a "man's problem" as a problem in itself, as a question in relation to woman? Is that what God desired when He created woman? No. He desired that she should be a help for man as his *vis-à-vis*¹ (Gen. ii. 18); i.e. a strength, not a question. In order to receive real help, we turn rather to that which is strong than to that which is weak (except in certain cases where weakness means strength), to the strong opposite pole, so that the two poles may maintain human nature in equilibrium.

By means of this equilibrium God desired to secure for man his freedom, that is, a free exchange between Him and mankind, the precondition of all living culture upon earth. But it is just that which man does not desire. He desires neither that freedom nor that equilibrium, and therefore does not desire the help of woman either. Nowhere have I found a better formulation of this thought than in a book by the Catholic poetess and authoress Gertrud von Le Fort². She believes that God irrevocably creates only by means of the two dimensions of being of which man and woman are the incarnation; and she says: "In the co-operation of woman as *sponsa* of his spirit, man experiences his own creativity as simply a co-operation in the work of the alone-creative God". And further: "The creative man who no longer

¹ This translation is to be found in several other languages. Wilhelm Vischer says on page 69 of the book quoted above: "The reader who does not know Hebrew is not to think that this translation is a more or less violent interpretation, an attempt on my part to insert the *vis-à-vis* into the text. 'As his *vis-à-vis*' is the literal translation of the Hebrew '*kenegdo*'. The Eternal Invisible One, who gives Himself as the *vis-à-vis* of man, desires to give man also a visible *vis-à-vis* in a being like himself."

² *Die Ewige Frau* (Eternal Woman), S. 77. Verlag Josef Kösel und Friedrich Pustet, München.

gives God the glory proclaims just himself, and so must in practice exclude at the same time the religious and the feminine elements in the line of culture. In the exclusive claim of man to culture, the totality of being breaks asunder along both the immanent and the transcendent line." In other words: man desires to avoid his rightful polarity with woman, because his instinct as a rebellious creature warns him that he can give that polarity its proper basis only *after* he has found his rightful polarity with *God*. Man can be alone-creator only in his unipolarity. And woman has to accept that as an authority willed by God! For that reason man prescribes to woman the nature of her femininity and the limits which she must observe. And for that reason he is afraid when she transgresses them without his permission and when the other pole of existence makes itself felt through her. But in devoting himself in free flight to his own pole, man becomes, not as he expected a master, but a slave. At a given moment he no longer has it in his control, and immediately becomes a prey to all sorts of demons which take possession of him. Today the modern fanatic, unbalanced to the last degree, screams his hysteria over the whole world. If St. Paul could hear him, he would order him to cover his head, not merely with a veil but with a helmet "because of the angels", and to put on a muzzle into the bargain!

The question may rightfully be asked: May a woman thus impeach the masculine spirit? Is it not perhaps she who has brought about the trouble, and who is in any case just as responsible as man is for the evil in the world? Agreed. The peculiar position of woman gives her no right to be more favourably estimated than man. Every time that woman is tempted to give way to resentment or spite, she should just ask herself: Whose fault is it? Besides, a feminine unipolarity — if that be possible — would be just as monstrous a perversity as the masculine unipolarity which we know.

Woman has sinned against God and against man in acknowledging the superiority of the latter and so denying her own vocation. So she has brought a curse upon herself: "Thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over

thee " (Gen. iii. 16). Man does not desire the wholly other, he desires the eternal masculine, whatever Goethe may say. But woman too desires the eternal masculine. Man must turn to God and afterwards to woman, while woman must turn to God and afterwards to herself. Account is not generally taken of the degree to which this curse of Genesis has become a complex in the soul of all womankind. Here lies the woman's problem in the Christian sense and, it may perhaps be added, in the Divine sense of the term too.

A complex does not heal in a few days; and a complex of this extent does not heal in several centuries, especially not in a world where men are in a position to erect a system of ethics, laws, institutions upon the basis of any instinct and to crown the whole with the superscription: Divine Order of Creation. In order to heal such complexes there is need of a Saviour; and in order to lay bare such structures there is need of the Son of God Himself.

Both the laying bare and the healing have taken place. From now on, nobody can any longer maintain that Jesus Christ came to confirm the curses of the Old Testament or to sublimate them into Divine Orders.

There is a kind of Christian who does not tire of repeating: What is the use? We cannot alter the world or ourselves. We can do nothing on our own account. But that is no reason for imposing upon others burdens which one would not suffer for one second oneself. These people have a dangerous inclination to believe in sin, and so give enormous pleasure to the devil; for to believe in sin means to maintain it. It appears to me to be better to believe in the forgiveness of sins and also to accept it, i.e. to realize it in our life and in our day. Jesus Christ turns to those who accept forgiveness when He says: "Be ye therefore perfect even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect". For I cannot admit that these words signify merely a bitter jest or merely a crushing condemnation. Rather do I believe that He therewith lays upon us the burden — a heavy burden, but one which is honourable because it is accompanied by His promise — that we will be re-created in the image of God. Of that

image we are told in the Old Testament : " In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made He him ; male and female created He them ; and blessed them, and called their name Adam (mankind), in the day when they were created " (Gen. v. 1, 2).

The Christian View of Marriage

A. G. PITE

Some people seem to think that marriage is a peculiarly Christian institution. They imply that left to himself Man would adopt some much looser form of association. There are many opinions about what is this " natural " relation between the sexes, but most popular views today would make monogamous marriage not natural but artificial. Some say man is by nature polygamous, though few, I imagine, would add that polygamy is also natural for woman. Others suggest that chastity before marriage or faithfulness in it are equally unnecessary. There are those who attack marriage on biological, on psychological and on social grounds. To few or none of them does it seem to occur that monogamous marriage may be more truly normal than any of their alternatives. It is something imposed by Church or State on our unwilling and ill-fitting nature ; and they see the task of the reformer as that of delivering mankind from the bondage of a false and out-of-date authority.

" Natural " is a difficult and ambiguous word which it would perhaps have been better to avoid. But it plays so large a part in the thinking of the ordinary young man and woman that to avoid it would probably have been to miss the main point at issue today. No satisfactory definition can be attempted here. Certain questions about the use of the word can, however, be asked. By " Natural " do we mean primitive ? Some people seem to ; yet they would be very unwilling to revert to the primitive in other human

relations than the sexual. They could not advocate a return to the primitive in magic or hygiene or tribal organization or in control of the forces of nature.

Others seem to mean instinctive. They suggest that marriage, at any rate Christian marriage, is at war with the ordinary man's and woman's personality. But they would not suggest that the control and direction even by law of man's instinctive attitude to fighting or food was unwise or unnecessary. The history of man and of civilization is the story of the development and of the increasing control not only of his environment but of himself and of his relations with his fellows. The real issue about marriage is not whether it is natural in the sense of primitive or instinctive, but whether it is the best instrument that can be devised to express that part of man's and woman's sexual nature which is best worth expressing and in the way that will be most valuable for the future of the race.

Marriage and the family have become established so widely not by the decision of priest or statesman but by the happy experience of countless husbands and wives, fathers and mothers. Where marriage and the family have been honoured, there have grown up stable and healthy societies. These who have found the secret, have passed it on to their children; and by its success it has become increasingly the habit of humanity. A partnership so close and so exacting would never be tolerated for long unless it had in it a tremendous natural strength. No legislation or convention or opinion would be able by itself to tie so tight a knot. The most they can do is to help and protect a kind of life in itself of the highest worth to those who find it.

If we want then to form a Christian view of marriage, it is wise to start by understanding marriage itself, whether Christian or other. To understand marriage, we need to understand the nature of love. This today is no easy matter. Love is one of those words which is used in many senses and sometimes with no sense at all. The most casual passing attraction, a gust of passion, a diffused interest, a feeling of friendliness or concern, all may get the name of love at one time or another and none of them may deserve it.

The modern novel, the cinema and the daily paper use and misuse the word thoroughly enough. From a study of them love would appear to be capricious, volatile, unpredictable, irrational. All they seem to be sure of about love, is that it never lasts for long, that like Cupid it is blind and that it shifts from one object to another for no reason except that it cannot remain fixed.

It is true that an element of passionate feeling enters into any true love, that a marriage which has no touch of passion is unsatisfactory and incomplete. But passion by itself is not love; and marriage is built on love, not on passion. This is perhaps the chief error of today. There is this almost universal teaching that the relations of men and women are governed by passionate sexual attractions and repulsions, that these forces are difficult to control and dangerous to suppress or interfere with, and, worst of all, that they are "love". At their best they can be a joyfully employed part of the mechanism of love in marriage; at their worst they are love's destruction.

Over against the melodramatic and the semi-psychological views of love so common today we are fortunately able to set a great weight of human knowledge and experience of a different sort. When we care to remember, we know that true love has certain abiding qualities; and it is these qualities which explain the widespread persistence and strength of marriage despite the multitude of forces which work against it. These disruptive forces are, of course, particularly active in a society that tolerates great inequalities of wealth, or slavery, or bad housing, or that encourages too early or too late marriages for its members. Marriage would not have survived our countless social sins and stupidities, if there were not vast reserves of power and virtue to maintain it.

Of the many qualities of a true and complete love, three seem most worthy of notice for the present purpose. First, the one who loves puts the person loved first and himself second. Love is a transfer of interest and concern from yourself to another. The more complete the love, the more complete the transfer of concern. We recognize this easily enough in the love of parent for child, in the self-sacrifice

of the true patriot or saint, in the highest type of friendship. Often enough we forget even to expect it in courtship or marriage. Here only we seem to think that love has "rights" instead of duties alone. Most of the problems of pre-marital continence and many of the strains of early married life would never even arise if the "other regarding" nature of any love worth the name were acknowledged and remembered.

The second quality of love is that it always contains the wish to share. We all know how tiresome this can be in a one-sided affection. We have known the acquaintance who would have our friendship before we are ready to give it, and whose desire for our company, care for our business and inquisitiveness about our thoughts are so natural but so harassing. The desire to share is inevitable to love; and again, the more complete the love, the more complete must be the sharing. A physical attraction, a common interest, the same faith, any one by itself is not enough. Together, there is hope both for love and marriage. To share a home, to share the intimacies of married life, is to ask for strain and trouble and not for happiness and freedom if there are any limits to the sharing, any cupboards of memory or occupation to which one partner only holds the key. Marriage is an experiment in sharing, and an experiment that must be carried on and developed to the end. Christian marriage must include all this, and with it the added joy of sharing in the knowledge and service of Christ.

The third fact about love, too often disregarded, is that it is a growing thing. Love is not satisfied with any partial fulfilment, neither is it ever satisfied with yesterday's achievement. This again we all recognize in the relation of parent and child. A mother may love her baby completely; but as the child grows, so does the love. As personality develops, as experience accumulates, so love grows. It cannot stay still. If it does not grow, it shrinks; and for love to shrink we all feel as frustration. Again, we must admit that much contemporary opinion about marriage is overshadowed by the assumption, for it is not a formulated belief, that love is unstable, wavering, transitory, that when the first raptures of courtship and marriage are passed there is a bleak desert

of humdrum existence, only to be survived by a tolerance and a commonsense which recognize that for society or for the children's sake a partnership no longer romantic or strong in itself is yet worth some effort to preserve. The glamour may pass, though many throw it away unnecessarily, but love is greater than glamour and does not need its aid for strength or permanence. There is always more for love to do in exploration and conquest.

Marriage, then, has come into existence and has grown to be the strongest and most persistent human institution because of the kind of creatures men and women are. Because we love, we marry and find in marriage the fullest expression of our truest selves. Because we marry, we love, learning in the finest school the lessons of self-control, of giving, of sharing and of growth that make life every year fuller and more complete. There have been many failures : no success has perhaps been complete. There will be many more. But the measure of success is the persistence of the habit, and the growing record of love and joy and freedom released for mankind through true marriages.

There are, of course, innumerable questions of greater and lesser importance that press for an answer about the habits of courtship and marriage in the contemporary world. They vary from country to country and from class to class. In an age of such rapid change, of new knowledge in psychology and biology, of new wealth and new poverty, of wider education and of the emancipation of women, our institutions and conventions come under review and radical criticism. It is inevitable and good that they should. A couple contemplating marriage today have less help from the customs of their fore-fathers than for centuries past. The size of families, the right and manner of limitation, the responsibility of inheritance, a justifiable standard of living, are all in question. In face of this confusion the Christian is in the strongest position of all.

He can examine the nature of love and trust in the results of his study, for he alone believes in a God Who has revealed Himself as Love. He is in less danger than others of taking a soft or superficial view of what this love

means, for he knows that it was love that led the Son of God to the Cross. He will consider the possibility of having children of his own in quite a different way from the man who does not share his belief, for he can trust in God to give them those greatest gifts of faith and love and peace which no human being can give to his children. His attitude to himself, his wife and his children is subtly changed and strengthened beyond all calculation as he accepts marriage and the family as a work for God in the building of His Kingdom. To understand what he is undertaking he will study to learn the way of love. For strength to carry out what he learns, he has all the resources of the Universe, the boundless strength of the Holy Spirit.

What have we as Christians to say upon the Marriage Crisis of our Times ?

EDUARD THURNEYSSEN

The Present Bewilderment

It is a difficult and serious discussion upon which we enter when we speak of the present-day crisis of marriage. Who would dare to offer himself here as a guide ? ! Who would not rather keep silence and listen to others who know better how to show the way through this thicket, so peculiarly tangled for the people of today ? ! And yet it must be talked about. I honestly do not feel myself to be a specialist in this matter. But I am a pastor at the front. And to be at the front quite certainly means standing in the midst of the problems — problems which are often heart-rending — which arise before us from this very thing, the modern marriage crisis. There are certainly many other immense practical problems for us present-day Europeans, such as the economic crisis or the war problem. But are not the slaveries and confusions which arise from these other problems, despite all their difficulty and the despair that may be connected

with them, more bearable after all than the problem of a ruined marriage or, in more general terms, the problem of a confused and disordered relation to the other sex ? How many accusations and conflicts of conscience, how many tragedies — secret at first, then breaking out openly — have their roots here ! How much guilt and sorrow that arise here are concealed in nearly every family ! How rare are the people who do not bear within themselves a great distress and disillusion at this point of their relation to the other sex ! How rare are the marriages of which one has the impression that they were really made in heaven ! How rare are the marriage-partners who could look each other honestly in the eyes and say : “ We have joy in one another ! We look thankfully into the past and calmly into the future ; we should never for a moment have wished to go another way than that on which we are now engaged together ! ” Must one not say : Even if all the other questions were solved, even if there were no more social problem and no more war crisis, but the crisis of the unsolved relation between man and woman still remained, so much sorrow would issue from that source alone that the salvation from all those other crises would be entirely cancelled by this single unsolved question of the sexes. And how little does the Church, our Christian faith, know about how to say the saving word in this situation of distress !

The Man-Woman Relationship Essential to Human Life

There has probably been a marriage problem always and everywhere. For there have always and everywhere been marriages or institutions similar to marriage ; and the life of humanity has always and everywhere existed, and still exists, in its dual character of manhood and womanhood. Have we, indeed, already thought out what it means that there is no human-in-itself, no human being that is only human and nothing but human, but rather that human beings exist only either as man or as woman ? That is already so in the Bible : “ So God created man in His own image, in the image of God created He him ; male and female created He them ” (Gen. i. 27). It is the one fundamental fact which

is given along with our existence as human beings that we humans exist only as a pair. We spring not from one, but always from two human beings, from a man and a woman. And we exist only in twos, we exist only as man or as woman.

And that means — how could it be otherwise ? — that we are confronted with one another : all our life long we have somehow or other to reckon with the fact that we are placed before this *vis-à-vis* in the other sex. The man is man only because there is another sex, a woman, over against whom he is what he is, namely, man. The woman is woman only because there is also another sex, man, over against whom she is what she is, namely, woman. Indissolubly and all our life long we are thus placed over against one another, and have thus to live our life with one another and before one another. To put it otherwise : we have as man and as woman a responsibility towards one another. The man is asked how he lives and answers for his life, as the sexual being man that he is, before the woman who stands over against him. And the woman has the same question put to her from the man's side.

We do not make that nearly clear enough to ourselves. We just go on living away, we men in our mannishness, as though we were alone in the world, and the women in their womanishness, as though they were alone in the world. We build our men's world, and we dream our women's world — and we do not consider the fact that neither of them exists. In reality there exists only the world in which both sexes, connected with and related to one another, have to live *with one another*. Out of the fact that we do not consider this ; that we are only very seldom conscious of our responsibility, of the responsibility of the man before the woman and the woman before the man ; that we do not consider that the woman looks to us as men in all our thoughts, words and actions — even when we are quite by ourselves, — and *vice versa*, that the woman does not consider that man looks to her — out of that fact arises our sin in this matter : and that sin is the cause of all the immense confusion which is continually arising concerning our manhood and womanhood. We ought, we really ought, to seek the *order* which is given us of

God in this as in every other matter. We ought to seek the place in which each of us is set by the Creator — the man as man over against the woman, the woman as woman over against the man.

Marriage as an Order of God

And at this point the primary meaning of the word *marriage* is disclosed to us. Marriage — that is the fundamental order which is given us in this affair. Man and woman are to take their position over against one another seriously, and to realize it, in this way, that they come together into a life-fellowship which is to be realized — we shall have to speak of this again — only between one given man and one given woman, and that means in a monogamous union for life. It is commanded us that we do not withdraw ourselves in any facile way from this coming together. We are not to behave as if we were not man and not woman, as though we were spiritual beings, as though we were angels. We are not angels. We are human beings. But we are to come together as one comes together in the life-fellowship of marriage, that is, bound to one another monogamously and for the duration of one's life. It is not allowed us to give ourselves up to unbounded sexuality as though we were animals. We are not animals. We are human beings. So marriage is set in the midst of the never-ending mutual relations in which we have to live as man and as woman. So it is the guiding-point by which we must orientate ourselves if we desire to live really orderedly, guarded and protected from the enormous confusion which would immediately break in upon us if we were either not to know or to underestimate this order of marriage. Order is the contrary of arbitrariness. But arbitrariness is just that sin of irresponsible living away without a guiding-point. But one lives arbitrarily as man and as woman if one leaves the order of marriage out of sight. And indeed, this holds good not only for the marriage-partners themselves, but for everybody, for those who are single as well. The single or widowed person also has always to keep in view this guiding-point of marriage as the principle which governs his life as a sexual being.

Even as a single person, he lives arbitrarily as soon as he ceases to live in such a way that he could at all times answer for his life as man or as woman over against the order of marriage instituted by God. One is asked, even as a single person, indeed, just as a single person in one's manhood or womanhood, whether one holds marriage sacred — the marriage of others or even only marriage as a possibility for oneself or for others. The man who concerns himself as a man with a girl without desiring her in marriage, the girl who approaches the man as a girl and desires him, without considering that between man and woman as regards their sex the sanctity of marriage is always in question — that man, that girl have infringed, even broken, marriage, no less than the man and the woman who break marriage within marriage. Marriage means, marriage is, the only ordered, the only God-willed sexual relation between man and woman in accordance with the Creation. The old commentators saw quite rightly when they found the story of the first pair of human beings in the Bible to be in itself, quite simply and quite directly, the institution of the state of marriage. Adam and Eve before the Fall — that quite certainly means man and woman living not arbitrarily but in the order of God. And living in the order means living in marriage.

Marriage as a Commandment of God

But now let us consider a second fact. Adam and Eve are no longer before the Fall. We know man and woman only as sinful human beings. And that at once means that the order of marriage is for us no longer an order which is simply present as a matter of course. That at once means that we stand in need at this point as at all others. And after what we have said it will be clear what a need it is. Simply the need of sin, the need of arbitrariness. We are living outside the order of God. But now, the further fact must here at once be added, that God has not left us in that arbitrariness, in the dis-order of our sin. He has had mercy upon us. And mercy means : He has not indeed made us sinless, so that we should be able to live in the order again as a matter of course in a paradisaical way and without any

special command ; but He has given us His Commandment. We live in arbitrariness ; but the Commandment is there which binds and restrains us — binds us by calling us to order. But order in this matter means — as we have heard — marriage. Thus : marriage, just marriage, is given to us again, but now in the form of the Commandment. In saying that, we are already speaking of *Jesus Christ*. We are speaking of that which we have to say in the marriage crisis of today. That is Jesus Christ, that is the Gospel, — that God in His Son turns to us men and does not simply leave us to our sin. But just in order that it may really tear us out, this Gospel, God in His Son, comes to us as He who commands us, who gives us the order : “Thou shalt not commit adultery ! ” We must understand the Commandment as a protective railing along which we can now go, guided by His mercy. It is a merciful measure through which God desires to keep us from falling into the curse of sin. We have in mind the Seventh Commandment and the rule in the Sermon on the Mount which expounds that Commandment.

And now, that is the first and probably the last thing too which we have to say as Christians upon the marriage crisis of today : Salvation, truth, help in this matter can come to light only when the Commandment of God which sanctifies marriage is once again set up among us. The setting up of the Commandment, the setting up of marriage, marriage as a Commandment — that is the help needed in the marriage crisis of today. One can say without exaggeration that all, really all the counsel, admonition or comfort that we can give in particular must start out from, and be built up on, a real setting up of marriage before the eyes of men as the Commandment of God. Extraordinarily different things may have to be advised as regards the details. The advice may perhaps lead to that extreme limit where nothing is left but the advice to divorce — but even if that counsel should have to be given, it may not (however strange it may sound) be given with any other purpose than that of demanding respect and obedience towards the real sanctity of true marriage.

The Forgetting of the Order and the Commandment

That is the fundamental thing that must always be kept in mind in this matter — this three-fold thing : — marriage as God's order of Creation ; our sin as arbitrariness which breaks that order ; the Grace of God which gives us the Commandment in order to call us back *as sinners* to that order. But now, the enormously serious element in the situation of today is that this setting up of the Commandment has become so extraordinarily difficult, indeed well-nigh impossible. For if anything is true for the man of today — at any rate for the European of today — it is this, that he simply does not recognize anything of the kind any more : an order, a Commandment, which are valid for him because they come from God. I do not need to waste words on that fact. We no longer know that there exists a bond of man to the Commandment of God. And because we hardly know that any longer today, therefore the distress in this very area has become so incurable. We have said that there has always been a marriage crisis, for there has at all times been a breaking of the order. But yet there were times in which the order itself remained valid as an order, and was presupposed even in the act of breaking it. Marriage was broken then too ; but it was known that it was marriage, the order of marriage, that was being broken through. But today marriage is broken with that uncanny easiness which betrays that it is no longer known that an order has been broken. Marriage-breaking (*Ehebruch* : adultery) is no longer a breaking at all ; it is only the dissolution of a relationship which from the beginning was never thought of and willed as a firm and enduring one. Why should one not break it, then ? The marriage crisis of today does not consist in the existence of specially appalling vices and dissipations ; it consists rather in the more dangerous and subtle fact of an uncanny general uncertainty regarding any rule and order at all in this matter. To break orders is bad and dangerous ; but not to know any orders at all, on principle so to speak, is much worse and more dangerous still, — it is the really demonic or even Satanic factor in the life of our times. I am thinking of numerous conversations

which I have already had to conduct in this matter with people of today, conversations in which I encountered, not indeed any especial reprobacy, but certainly that unboundedness, that arbitrariness, that so extraordinarily matter-of-course freedom of the persons in question in disposing of their own manhood or womanhood, which is the sure token that they no longer knew of any Commandment which could limit and bind human arbitrariness, and so ultimately knew of no responsibility before God and before man. It is really an accepted thing in our time that man and wife should set each other free, consciously and purposely, not only before marriage, but within marriage itself. And now it must also be taken into account that this inner dissolution falls in a time which has endangered the order of marriage from outside also in a most extraordinary way. We have in mind the fact that woman has been set free from the realm of the household, that she has been drawn into the process of labour and economics. We have in mind the complete cessation of the protection of neighbourship and morals in the great modern city. We have in mind the collapse of all outward conventions, the complete emancipation in the relations of the sexes today, as expressed in the modern dancing and bathing activity. We have in mind the erotic excitement produced by books and the cinema; we have in mind especially the theoretical dissolution of marriage as an order by the modern doctrine of trial- or companionate-marriage. We have in mind, finally and above all, the unheard-of increase in the difficulty of marriage for young people as a result of economic hindrances. As we were taking counsel together in the Church of Basle two years ago concerning the birth-control question, our doctors told us that they have hardly a consultation-hour when they are not asked for help in abortion by young people who love each other and yet cannot marry. Indeed, how is the order to be kept when marriage is impossible to hundreds and thousands of people for purely external reasons? And yet the fact remains: there is no other way out of this almost insoluble distress than that of the setting up again of the order, of the Commandment of marriage. The knowledge of the saving mystery of what it means to be

bound by God's Word must re-awaken quite freshly and from within. It will be one of the decisive tasks especially of education to prepare the way for such an awakening in the generation which is growing up. It will above all depend upon a quite new endeavour of the Church to understand what the Word of God means and is. And so in the end, much, if not everything, will depend upon a profound and penitent re-orientation of the theology and preaching of the Church in this matter. Only a Church which once again confesses its allegiance in doctrine and life to the Word of God and to the Commandment given in that Word, only a confessing Church will really be able to find the way for itself, and to show the way to our times, even in this difficult matter. That does not exclude, but includes, a tough and relentless fight — from *within* the Church — for social relations which will again make marriage possible, among young people especially ! The one thing depends on the other. The way to social action leads directly from confession, and straight back to confession.

Now let me enter quite shortly upon a few special questions which must be dealt with if we are to speak properly in detail concerning the building up of marriage upon the Word of God. The following points are to be considered : the Church character of marriage ; monogamous marriage ; sexual intercourse in marriage ; the question of procreation ; marriage as a life-partnership ; divorce. Only a very few remarks can be made upon each of these points.

The Church Character of Marriage

If we were Catholics, we should now have to speak of the Sacrament of Marriage. But we are not going to do so. We expressly deny that marriage is a Sacrament, quite simply because it is not regarded as such in Holy Scripture. But instead we say with all the greater emphasis that marriage is possible in the right way only if it has its basis, and is conducted, within the Church, as a Church marriage. I might also say, only if it is founded and conducted in faith. What does that mean ? That brings up the question of the basis upon which marriage rests. Does it rest, for instance,

upon human decrees ? Does it rest upon the fact that the one can say to the other ; we bear within ourselves a power of attraction to one another so strong that it is sufficient to bind us both together all our life long ? Or is the due contraction of a civil marriage before the public authorities to be regarded as the basis which supports it ? Answer : Certainly love must be there, human decision for one another must be there ; the marriage must also be legally and duly contracted : but all that is not the basis of marriage. Or rather, all that is its basis only if it in its turn is based upon a power which springs from a quite different source. What is the basis of marriage ? — The fact that it is not only our human arrangement, but a place or an order that God has founded, a place or an order over which God watches with His mighty Will. One enters rightly into marriage when one enters into it as into a place or order in which one is subject to God's Will and accordingly to God's protection also. One enters rightly into marriage if one knows, in all one's human lovingness, that we are not doing only our own will, we are doing the Will of God when we marry. God gives us to one another. He speaks to the man at the place of marriage : I give thee this thy wife ; and He speaks to the wife at the place of marriage : I give thee this thy husband. Thus is marriage founded. Both partners must know that — and know it all their lives ; — then their marriage is properly founded. Whence then can one know that ? I answer : God says this to us if we as married people subject ourselves to His Word. But that means : if we stand within the Church. To subject oneself to His Word just means to live in the Church, to stand in faith. If one lets this be said to him : It is not I who have myself chosen my husband or my wife, but we have been given to one another by the Hand of God, — then the ring which is laid about us in marriage really holds. Then even crises may come, shadows may arise in the sphere of human lovingness and mutual understanding, but the power which comes from the Word of God is strong enough to hold the married people together in all their distress.

That is the great and simple discovery which so many married people must make again today : they must recognize

— we do not belong to one another only on our own account, only in virtue of our love (which has perhaps shown itself unstable in the crisis of our marriage); but we belong to one another, even in this instability, because God has given us to one another. Often married people will have to go through real crises before they arrive at that discovery. I have already found desperate people, husbands and wives who despaired of their marriage, who needed this very despair in order to see: God has bound me to this my wife, this my husband. For God's sake I may not surrender my post at his or her side. And then it might happen that even inwardly broken marriages were made whole by that insight. Must I still give a sketch of the contrary modern view? There one may certainly live one's marriage, in certain circumstances, in a high and spiritual way, live it in the power of a strong human love; but one lives it simply and solely in one's own strength. One knows nothing of that ultimate bond, and therefore nothing of that ultimate protection either, which flow from God's Word alone. And if then the hour comes when the spiritual element which bound the married couple evaporates, when the love which they felt for one another grows cold, then the marriage is at an end. Must I still indicate the significance which Church marriage gains from that point of view? I know its questionability. But I also know that the Word spoken there in the Church has done to more than one married couple, in the marriage crisis of the times, the decisive service of putting them in the right place, the place of a marriage really contracted before God. And so the Church cannot take this commission too seriously, especially in the circumstances of today.

Monogamous Marriage

From what has been said above there follows the clear insight into the fact that marriage is true marriage only as monogamous marriage. When God binds a man to his wife at the place of marriage, then it is certainly not just any woman whom He hands over to him for his use as a so to say anonymous sexual being, but it is the one particular woman, the woman who bears a proper name which belongs to her

alone, it is the woman as a person, the woman who is unique and unrepeatable, to whom He binds the man. And exactly the same is of course true of the woman in relation to the man. For it is quite certainly part of the real hearing of the Word of God in the marriage ceremony that the names are called out, and that means that husband and wife are to know : this particular woman, this particular man is the consort indicated for me. Have we still to speak of a command to keep marriage, if, for instance, I might doubt whether the woman or the man assigned to me in my marriage were really the only one who could possibly be given me by God as consort ? If any one were to think from the start that perhaps there are still other possibilities for me, then he would only have trifled with marriage ; but to trifle with marriage means to break marriage in oneself. On the basis of the Word of God there is really nothing else but that definite, mysterious but real assignation of this particular woman, this particular man, and no further even imaginable possibility. We know what a struggle that means ! Just the struggle against that kind of trifling of man with woman, woman with man, before and within marriage. Whenever the man desires the woman and the woman the man, then they must mean everything, the whole of life, a monogamous union for life. But we know that the trifling of man with woman and woman with man is in our times quite an accepted thing. We know that it is even disguised with the appearance of order by speaking of trial-marriage or of companionate-marriage — as though one could speak of marriage in any sense at all in cases where monogamous marriage, as a life-long union of one man with the one woman, of one woman with the one man, is denied as it were on principle ! They are really nothing but triflers who think that by this sham they can evade the seriousness which has always meant that everything was involved when man and woman really met one another. The tragedy of these trial-marriages lies in the fact that, just where one thought at first that one could trifle, things between the two suddenly show in the most painful way their desire to become serious. The marriage crisis of today arises out of just that fact, that

people think they can play that game consciously and go unpunished for it. The tragedies which arise out of that indeed show clearly enough that it is not so. Man and woman still pay for it with their life every time. Not to speak of the fact that in hundreds of cases the illegitimate child which was the fruit of that game has to pay for it with its life too.

Sexual Intercourse in Marriage

Just because marriage means and desires the whole of life, it is the place, the only legitimate place, where human beings give each other their whole life, share their life; body and soul, with one another. That is what is meant by the sexual relationship as it takes place in marriage. Sexual intercourse is a token, the strongest and final token, which two beings of different sex set up between one another, can and should exchange with one another, in order to attest to one another their real and total together-belongingness, so far as that exists on earth. Because marriage is a matter of this together-belongingness, that token ought also to be set up. We have two remarks to make here. There are more couples than perhaps we think who do not understand that the setting up of that token is a serious Divine Commandment. The sexual as such is subject in very many quarters to mistrust, to disparagement, to defamation. Marriage is as it were divided into two halves : a spiritual, psychical fellowship, and a bodily, sexual fellowship. But true marriage, it is thought, takes place in the psychical-spiritual sphere, whereas the bodily, sexual side represents a lower stage which can be thought of only with a certain regret. The sexual is regarded, if not exactly as something sinful, yet nevertheless as something unbeautiful, animal rather than human. A complete break must be made with that view. It comes from the Roman Catholic Church, where things are regarded as though sexual life, both within and without marriage, were in itself the place whence sin arises. And therefore he who seriously serves God holds himself as far as possible away from it. Hence the celibacy of the priests. It was the deed of the Reformers that they broke

with that view. They no longer considered themselves to be nearer to God, to be better and holier, if they avoided sexual intercourse in marriage. They contracted marriage, knowing that here too, and just here, they could and should live in obedience before God in the power of the forgiveness of sins. In doing so, they invoked the Name of God the Creator. Sexual life does not have nothing to do with God. It is not connected with His Creation any less really than life in general. God created men, *God*; male and female created He them. We fight against the Commandment of God the Creator if, in a false over-spirituality or even over-sanctity, we do not abide by the fact that we are what we are before Him : a man and a woman. We should not be ashamed of that. Not in marriage at all events. Countless marriages break down at this point, that the woman does not perhaps feel free, does not feel as she was created to feel, at this point, and thus troubles and puts to shame the man. It is not to be wondered at if a door closes in him then, and he turns away from the woman because of the mortifications which he has suffered from her at this point. A really Christian education ought to teach man and girl again simply and straightly to abide by the fact of their own sexual life, and to do so even before marriage, and not to be ashamed of its impulses. But how much inner untruthfulness and distortion still holds sway at this point, just in so-called Christian education !

But one thing—and now we move towards the other side — must be said just as relentlessly truly and clearly : Affirmation of the sexual life — certainly ; but only in marriage. The fathers hammered that into us also as firmly as they could from the standpoint of the Bible : sexual intercourse outside marriage is sin and is subject to the curse upon all sin. Why ? Just because, if things are to happen in a truly human way, such intercourse cannot be anything but that ultimate token of the final and complete bond between two human beings. And that exists only in the form of marriage. We must here recall everything that has already been said concerning monogamous marriage. It is always an irresponsibility — whether crude or subtle — it is always a lack of restraint,

when two human beings give one another that token without knowing that they can, and that they desire to, belong to one another with all their life. We know what we are saying ; we know the tremendous distress which is acute today at this very point. We are living in a time of absolutely unbounded sexual intercourse outside marriage. And we know why too. It is not mere folly. It is the quite tremendous distress of the man and the girl who would perhaps like to marry and yet cannot, simply cannot — and now is it to be forbidden them to give one another this token of their union just as though they were married ? It is always one of the very hardest things to stand fast here in individual cases. But we must stand fast. We know the meaning of the Commandment. And we know how hardly especially the girl has to pay for her trespass. Two words are enough : unmarried mother, illegitimate child ! Whoever knows the amount of suffering and distress that is contained in these two words knows enough to stand fast here just because he desires to stand by the girl and with her also by the man.

The Question of Procreation

Sexual intercourse in marriage is legitimate only when it is not prevented from bearing fruit. I say that purposely : when it is not prevented from bearing fruit ! For that strikes upon the decisive point for us. It is not the case that it always bears fruit. The validity of marriage does not depend upon whether children are granted to the married couple. Even the purpose of sexual intercourse is not described by saying that it must subserve the procreation of children. It is first of all valuable in itself and valid as that token of which we have spoken. But now, beyond that, and in addition to that, God has taken sexual intercourse in marriage into service. It is His Will that it should subserve propagation. We are thinking of the sequence : "God created man ", and then : "And God said, be fruitful and multiply ! " (Gen. i. 27, 28). It is clearly His Will that the one should depend upon the other. And it would be frightful arbitrariness, and trespassing of His Commandment, if we men were to tear them apart. There is accordingly to be

no marriage in which there is not clearly present the will of the married couple for children. Here again, we know that we are swimming against the tide when we say that. For arbitrariness has swept in just here like a veritable tide. Just in this matter people are least aware today of being bound to a Divine Will. By means of the technique of birth-control, people have as it were snatched to themselves the mystery of procreation. The purposely unfruitful marriage has become the rule. What takes place in the process is in reality the inner dissolution of marriage itself. It is only necessary to reflect for a moment : Why do married people today avoid the clear Will and Commandment of God for children ? There is always only a single reason : fear of the sacrifice. To have children just means sacrifice, means a burdening for husband and for the wife in the marriage. People avoid that sacrifice. But how then do such couples really live with and for one another in their marriage ? What does the inner bond of a couple who fear the sacrifice of a child look like ? Must not any such marriage collapse inwardly, collapse through that same self-seeking which prevents the couple from accepting the child from God's Hands ? And on the other hand : What meaning and joy of life for husband and wife stream out from the child accepted in obedience ! One can again and again experience that parents who for years did not want to have any child, and then in the end let themselves be given one after all, can hardly understand afterwards how they did without the child for so long.

We shall only mention the question of birth-control, which certainly arises here. It ought to receive separate treatment. Only thus much : Responsible birth-control is not excluded, but included, by what has been said ; for it is an obvious duty. There is certainly one kind of fruitful marriage, where child follows upon child, which is absolutely irresponsible. For there are always signs set up upon our way — here is the place for all that is to be said regarding the so-called social and medical indications — which can show us as married people whether it is indeed God's Will to give ourselves a child, or not. There are times in every

marriage when one really ought not to have a child ; and then one ought not to take it. Birth-control means to have regard to these signs. The criterion which is in question here will always lie in the question put to the couple : Is it self-seeking or lack of faith, if we do not dare to have a child ? Or have we really serious reasons for denying ourselves ? If then birth-control is an obvious duty, then certainly the question of the means to be employed in it must be brought up very seriously. Is abstention indeed the only permissible means ? Or are artificial means and measures also to be employed ? We shall not be able to say an unconditional No to the latter alternative ; but we shall have to surround it with the greatest reservations.

Marriage as a Life-Fellowship

We take from what has just been said only the one word : Self-seeking. Marriage is the place where through a whole life-time it is in the most real way the task of man and woman to overcome self-seeking. We cannot thank God enough for taking us in marriage into this school. From this standpoint, we cannot for a moment conceive of marriage, as the whole of modern times conceives of it, as the place where we have to seek and to find the elevation and broadening of our own life. But whoever is seeking for that other thing : for the place where he learns to overcome his own Ego and to make it his servant, — he is on the right track.

Divorce

The marriage crisis of today means the divorce crisis. One thing is clear : in view of the general secularization of our times it cannot be wondered at that divorces are an accepted thing. Where no bond to God's Word is known, marriage cannot be kept . Therefore one thing is certainly not in place in face of the increasing number of divorces : Pharisaical condemnation. How should we condemn the world, which can after all hardly help not being able to keep its marriages ? Is not something quite different from censoriousness in place, namely mercy, and the inner impulse and commission to say God's Word to this world again, in

such a way that it too can allow itself once more to be bound by it. Many conversations with people who are just about to divorce can hardly proceed otherwise than to an attempt to say something to them of these ultimate factors in their divorce misery. Perhaps they divorce none the less, but have heard something on that occasion which gives them further guidance. Not to divorce cannot then be a commandment which can be applied blindfold to the whole world. In the world it will hardly go otherwise than that divorces will take place. One may not in this sense make out of the Commandment a law with which to torment others.

But where God's Word is known, there certainly divorce can never be anything but the absolutely excluded and impossible thing which cannot be reconciled with marriage as such. "What God hath joined, let not man put asunder" (Matt. xix. 6). Why then does divorce take place? Even with all due reservation and with no desire to judge, it will have to be said: Again and again divorce takes place because, and only because, people do not see their outward or inward claims of life being fulfilled in the marriage. But how can that point of view be maintained among Christians? People are bound together even when the claims of their life are supposedly or in reality not being fulfilled. Indeed, then the Commandment to overcome one's own Ego is relevant in a very special sense. According to Holy Scripture there are certainly two exceptions: the one is adultery (Matt. xix. 9); the other may appear if one party to the marriage knows nothing of faith (I Cor. vii. 15). In both cases, the inner presupposition which may lead to divorce is this, that the marriage which is perhaps to be annulled is already annulled from within, and that in certain circumstances one can no longer stand by such a marriage. Even then, things need not necessarily come to a divorce. Even then, divorce is at bottom the abnormal, the diseased thing, the breaking of an order, ultimately to be explained only by our sin, by the "hardness of our hearts" (Matt. xix. 5). Love and obedience will go even then to the utmost limit; but it may not be contested that there is in reality such an utmost limit. The question is even then an open one, how we can stand

before God, burdened by such a break of His order. Just at that point — let us say it again — we shall not judge one another, but entrust everything to the judgment of God. And we shall consider that just in that judgment of God there is mercy, forgiveness of sins, and the help to live on in the power of such forgiveness. We shall endeavour to set such people as are burdened by their divorce in the light of that judgment and that forgiveness. We shall set ourselves there along with them, bearing with them the crisis of marriage as it breaks out before us in the innumerable divorces of our times, hoping with them and therefore struggling that in the power of that forgiveness more and more broken marriages may not be annulled, but be made whole.

The Single State

Ought not a word upon the single state to be said as the last word in the marriage question, which is always the question of the relations of the sexes with one another? In this sense, that in any case the unmarried person may not be looked upon as something like half a human being! Ought not above all virginity, especially in our day when the way to marriage is barred to so many women, to be presented in our Evangelical Church quite freshly and on principle as a rich possibility of life? In Holy Scripture it is thus presented. Read I Corinthians vii. again from that point of view! Virginity may be a good, God-commanded possibility of life, because the way which is ultimately the only thing that matters in marriage is open to those who remain virgin also, indeed open to them in a special sense: namely, the way of love and service. It may come about that a girl learns to see that her life can be lived even without marriage as something worth-while and whole. She will free herself finally from the thought that a woman who is "left standing" is an inferior being. Her eyes may be opened to see what great tasks await just the unmarried woman just in our times.

In all this we have really only one thing to say: that we must hold to God's Word in quite a new way. God's Word is, in this matter also, the only thing that heals and helps. It condemns the self-seeking of all who live arbitrarily; and

it comforts the broken and down-cast. It discloses to us our sin; but it forgives it also. Even the marriage crisis of today is given us and prepared for us only to this end, that we may come in a quite new way to know the power of that Word.

An Eastern Orthodox View of Marriage¹

PAVLICK EVDOKIMOFF

Marriage: an End in Itself

Each sacrament makes man penetrate into a new world of being, deposits in him an element of eternity, and at the same time calls him to develop the gift received in the sacrament. Each sacrament is like a way to follow, and, in virtue of its sanctifying action, constitutes the most perfect of all terrestrial ways.

Marriage is a sacrament.

Now, the tradition of the Church exalts virginity, which nevertheless does not constitute a sacrament.

There is something strange and troubling in that, which justifies the desire to elaborate a conception of marriage which goes beyond that which is commonly accepted.

As a sacrament, marriage is at the centre of Christian values, and for that reason its study deserves to be pursued into its utmost depths.

That presents us with a series of extremely complex metaphysical problems.

First of all it must be asked whether the end of marriage is to be found within itself, or outside itself in what results from it, in what it creates.

The history of the institution of marriage from ancient times up to our own day visibly gives the preference to the

¹ This article consists of extracts selected by the Editor from the draft of a much longer article in French which has appeared in *Fede e Vita*.

second solution, and finds the end of marriage in the reproduction of the species. The fullness and the meaning of marriage would thus depend on the presence or absence of children.

That conception may be called rationalistic, in contradistinction to the mystical conception, which finds the end of marriage within marriage itself, independently of posterity.

In the ancient and Judaeo-Christian world, it is the rationalistic conception which predominates.

Troitzky, in his *Christian Philosophy of Marriage*, gives interesting information on this subject. The very term *matrimonium*, *matris-munus*, makes maternity the very substance of marriage; the Greek term *gamos* is derived from the root *gen*, to be born. Roman and Byzantine law, with Justinian and Leo the Philosopher; the Judaic law of the levirate; Greek philosophical thought; all attributed to marriage a normative function in the continuity of the race, as assuring the future of the fatherland and the immortality of the human race. Sterility in a woman was a sufficient cause for divorce, and in Judaism it was even a disgrace.

The founders of Patristic doctrine, being monks, and in most cases virgin, had no personal experience of marriage; its metaphysics and mystical basis were not at the centre of their interest and their preoccupations.

To the dawn of Christianity corresponds the heroic type of the virgin-man. The leaven thrown into the cosmic body of the world was virgin (not in the concrete and physical sense of the term, but in the mystical sense). This spirit of virginity was called to penetrate all forms of life. Unfortunately, in the historic process of Christianity, the leaven entrusted by Christ to the Church has discovered the limitations of the human nature of the Church; the poison of Monophysitism has often decomposed it and weakened its force. Patristic literature, so rich in ascetical treatises — particularly concerning the monastic state — is very poor as concerns the problems of marriage and the metaphysics of love.

St. Augustine hesitates between children and holy friendship as the end to be assigned to marriage.

Later on, scholastic theology in the West, and St. Thomas Aquinas, recognize that "*prolis est essentialissimum in matrimonio*". In the Encyclical "*Casti Connubii*" we do indeed find a broader conception: Marriage is "a gift, a gift which consequently presupposes forgetfulness of self and the will never to take oneself up again (total and perpetual), a reciprocal gift which the partners make to aid each other mutually on their journey towards their latter end"; and "in that mutual inner education of the partners, and in that assiduous application to work for their mutual perfection, there is indeed to be seen, as the Roman Catechism teaches, the cause and the primary reason of marriage, if one considers in marriage, not strictly the institution designed for the procreation and the education of children, but in a wider sense, a putting in common of the whole of life, a habitual intimacy, a society". But side by side with that, the *Codex juris canonici* is very categorical: "*matrimonii finis primarius est procreatio atque educatio prolis*". The mutual help of the partners, deliverance from the passions, devotion are only secondary ends, means to attain the essential thing: procreation.

On the other hand, one of the commissions of the Oecumenical Conference at Stockholm laid down in its report that "the essential end of marriage is the procreation of children".

Without doubt the external and social significance of marriage is also extremely great for the life of the human race. In his "Moral Poem", St. Gregory teaches that all human culture has its source in marriage. But that too is insufficient if one confines oneself to a study of marriage from the social point of view. If one does not rise above its utilitarian philosophy, one rests at the periphery of conjugal life, one loses sight of precisely that which is essential in marriage, the very phenomenon of love: that intimate element, known only to those who love each other, just that which is blessed and sanctified in the sacrament of marriage, and which constitutes the very matter of that sacrament: "the union of indestructible love". It is with reason that Léon Bloy says: "The matter of the sacrament of marriage,

the essential thing for the theologian, is mutual and entire consent, that is, love ”.

And that phenomenon is in itself perfectly a-social and extra-social ; it is bound, neither to the race nor to society, but only to personality. The fundamental aspect of marriage remains unknown for society, which knows only its consequences — the children, the family — and judges it through them.

There is a confusion here between the categories of use and meaning. Use necessarily requires an external object (cf. R. Guardini : *The Spirit of the Liturgy*). A flower may be *useful* to man for a decorative, artistic aim ; it may constitute the matter of the manufacture of another object (a perfume) ; it is useful for something outside itself. But the *meaning* of the flower is in itself, expressing by its very existence the cosmic beauty and harmony, the perfection and the fullness which glorify the Creator. One cannot say that that glorification is useful to the Creator ; but it issues from the fullness of being, belongs to the Divine Love. Marriage may or may not be useful to society ; but the meaning of marriage resides in itself.

There has always existed in humanity, besides the rationalistic theory which places the emphasis upon the utility of marriage and projects it outwards, the mystical conception which penetrates to its very depths and reveals a meaning which is sufficient in itself.

Marriage is, then, independent of posterity ; it appears as a road towards perfection and harmony, towards the fullness of being in supra-personal unity.

In the ancient Greek rites and mysteries, marriage was called “ *telos* ”, that is, “ end ” in the sense of “ crowning-point ”. The Pseudo-Areopagite writes : “ The Athenians call marriage “ *telos* ”, because it is marriage which crowns man for life ”. Troitzky also indicates that Eros, in Plato’s *Symposium*, is “ *epithymia tou holou* ”, that is, aspiration to integrality.

The Platonic tradition, which has penetrated deeply into the religious and philosophical thought of the Eastern

Church, has favoured the development of a mystical conception linked up with the metaphysics of sex.

That is one of the great traditions of Russian philosophy. Vladimir Soloviev has developed it with much force and clarity in a very profound study of the meaning and the metaphysics of love. He shows that the sexual differentiation is not bound up obligatorily with the life of the species, and that consequently love — *Eros* — has a higher meaning, not in the life of the species, but in the very personality of him who loves, in the transfiguration of sex. With the support of the data of history and natural history, he shows that the sexual factor is bound up, not with the fact of reproduction in general, but with that of the reproduction of the higher organisms. This is proved by the fact that in the animal world sexual attraction becomes stronger in proportion as the reproduction of the species becomes weaker. In the lower organisms there is a very great power of reproduction at the same time as a complete absence of sexual attraction, arising from the fact that the sexes are not differentiated. In more highly-developed organisms, the sexual attraction corresponds with a greater sexual differentiation. That attraction, weak at first, increases in the measure in which organic evolution develops and the power of reproduction diminishes, until at the summit, that is, in man, the strongest sexual love may appear despite a total absence of reproduction. So, then, if at the two extremities of life we find, on the one hand reproduction without sexual love and on the other hand sexual love without reproduction, it clearly appears that these two phenomena are not indissolubly connected, that each has its own significance, and that ultimately, even from the point of view of natural science, reproduction does not appear as the essential aim of sexual life (*cf.* Troitzky, *op. cit.*, p. 23, 25). The sexual differentiation, sex serving the species, has a profound meaning conformable with the idea of the higher being.

Any union of man and woman in marriage which has as its sole aim procreation (*procreatio prolis*) must be considered as immoral from the point of view of Christian ethics. That

would be, according to Berdiaev, an application of the principle of breeding to human relations.

To marry with the aim of extinguishing the passions (*concupiscentiae remedium*) is a sacrilegious attitude towards the Eros of marriage.

The marriage which is based upon the physical relationship is only a respectable form of debauchery, man being a blind victim of the sexual energy, and sex being then bound up, not with life but with death. The Freudian pan-sexualism is true for those who reduce marriage to physiology. Inversely, whoever despises marriage because of its physical element ought to be submitted to psycho-analytical therapeutics and cured of one of the many sexual *traumata*.

Aspiration to union with the loved one is not conditioned by pleasure. One marries because one loves, because one aspires to unity, because one is seized by the force of Eros, which is aspiration towards fullness of being, towards integrity of life, towards eternity. Physical love cannot be the basis of marriage, because it is in substance only symbolical.

The meaning and the mystery of sex are revealed in the great myth of man, the myth of Androgynon in the *Symposium*. According to Plato, Eros is the pursuit of wholeness. Aristophanes in that dialogue describes Eros thus: "Of all the gods he is the best friend of man, the helper and the healer of the ills which are the impediment to the happiness of the race... He leads us back to our primitive nature; he endeavours to make only one being out of two, and to repair the misfortune of human nature. Each of us is half a man... and each half is always in search of its other half... Such a necessity proceeds from the fact that our primitive nature was one, and that each of us then formed only a complete whole. Today we call love the desire and the pursuit of that ancient unity. If we are friends of the god and at peace with him, we shall find and meet with, in our loved ones, the complement of our selves — a happiness which at present falls to the lot of very few. If this return to the primordial state is the most perfect state, then that which brings us closest to it is necessarily the most perfect of present things."

"Man in the thought of God", says Berdiaev, "is an integral, masculine-feminine, solar-tellurian, logical and irrational being. And it is only as an integral being that he is chaste, wise, sophical in his fullness. As a divided, torn sexual being, he is not chaste, not wise, destined to disharmony, to the urge of the passions, to non-satisfaction. Original sin is bound up above all with this division of the sexes, with the fall of Androgynon, of man considered as an integral being, with the loss of human virginity and the formation of bad masculinity and bad femininity."

The catastrophe of original sin has had a repercussion within man; it has divided the sexes, destroyed totality, engendered the energy of sex with its repulsion and its attraction. Man, plunged in the dark and mysterious element of sex, languishes and thirsts after fullness, chastity, entirety; he is home-sick for the paradise lost of Androgynon. Sex, shut up in the subconscious, incessantly repressed by the human conscience, provokes neuroses and explosions (Freud). Civilization and social forces cannot gain a final victory over the polarity of human nature, over sexual energy. They can only ram it down into the *oubliette* of the subconscious, and so store up destructive forces.

The Sublimation of Marriage: the Union of Christ and the Church

The energy of sexual polarity permeates the human being in his entirety, his feelings, his mental and creative activity. "Man falls very low if he be overcome by the energy of blind sex, and rises very high by the sublimation of that energy" (Berdiaev).

The history of Christian asceticism shows us heroic efforts to conquer the sexual complex in man. For those who live in the world, the negative imperatives ought to harmonize with the creative orientation of sexual energy, with the process of its sublimation, with the transfiguration of Eros.

According to Vysheslavitsev, the whole of Christian asceticism is in substance a grandiose attempt at sublimation. But there are two kinds of asceticism: one is the eremitical

asceticism concerned with individual salvation, whose influence upon the outer world is exercised by prayer and sanctity; the other, quite different, is the asceticism of conjugal life, whose influence is exercised in the very midst of the world — the asceticism of transfiguration and creation in the world. Sex and its energy are talents given to each human being, organically bound up with his personality, and capable of being sublimated and by that means increased tenfold.

Imagination plays a special part in this process of sublimation; for it acts upon the subconscious, and a bond of organic relationship attaches it to Eros.

The power of imagination in the realm of art is very great. Art is creative imagination, and it is at the same time the incarnation of the beloved image in stone, in colour, in sound, in gesture, in flesh and blood. But art does not incarnate completely; it does not create a living object. Now only a living subject, only a living picture can evoke in its fullness the authentic Eros.

In marriage, it is the authentic Eros which arouses the living and concrete image which presents itself to those who love at the moment when they experience their unity, when they grasp the unique and eternal character of their meeting.

“For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall be joined unto his wife, and they two shall be one flesh. — This is a great mystery: but I speak concerning Christ and the Church” (Eph. v. 31, 32).

Marriage is here sublimated to the image of the union of Christ and the Church. What does the Apostle Paul understand by the unity of Christ and the Church? Eternity may be understood as that which surmounts every separate section of time. Each of these sections contains in it all the past, all the present, all the future. In the realm of space, eternity surmounts the non-penetration of the points in space, and transforms into unity that which is separated. The Body of the Eternal Christ, outside time and space, is omni-unity. In safeguarding the fullness of human individuality, it includes and bears in itself the whole Church to its utmost cosmic limits. The Church and the Body of Christ are con-corporeal, are two in one flesh.

That is the sublime ideal, the image of con-corporeality in marriage. The unity of Christ and the Church is also the supra-personal unity, the meeting of the Bridegroom and the Bride; and every meeting is a going outside of the self, a going to meet each other, a partial absorption of the other in oneself.

The unity of Christ and the Church is carried out in time; it is subject to the temporal process of the changing, the perfecting, the elevating of the Church... "that ye, being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height; and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fullness of God" (Eph. iii. 17-19). The apocalyptic image of the joyous meeting of the Bridegroom and the Bride sublimates the temporal Church in the celestial Kingdom. In the celestial Kingdom shall be revealed the unity and the love of Christ and the Church, that is, the whole of risen and transfigured humanity. The whole Trinity shares the love of Christ for the Church. Transfigured humanity goes beyond the frontiers of the temporal Church in the impulse of love for the Triune God. Love leads to a going outside oneself, creates a supra-personalism, and tends towards a total embracement. The Cosmos is embraced by the Love of the Holy Trinity, and gives itself entirely to the Triune God.

The force which attracts the Church towards unity with Christ is the impulse towards fullness inherent in every creature. "That ye might be filled with all the *fullness* of God" (Eph. iii. 19); "God our Saviour; who will have *all* men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth" (I Tim. ii. 3, 4).

For Vysheslavtsev, the process of sublimation is the re-establishment of the original form directed towards God. It is not only the outer and conscious chaos which has need of that form, but also the whole chaos of the subconscious world. That original form is the image and the likeness of God. The power which grasps that image is the imagination. One can well understand the importance which the Apostle Paul accorded to the image of Christ and the Church. The

image of the fullness of the man of Paradise has remained in Paradise beyond recall. The fullness of the man of the Kingdom will be a different fullness, hierarchically superior. Man has retained a profound home-sickness for the things he has lost. The image has been veiled by the catastrophe of original sin. Man may have the inward home-sickness for it ; but the image has lost its power of sublimation. The holiness of Adam before sin has become powerless, ineffective, without influence upon the man who lives after sin and in sin. The new holiness is a free surmountal of sin by means of Grace ; and only the image which beams with that new holiness can penetrate to the utmost depths of being and sublimite it with a supreme power.

Christ and the Church are living and concrete images which are before us, which live in our hearts.

Fullness of Life in Christian Marriage

In the canonical collections of the Eastern Church, marriage is sometimes defined as " the union of man and woman in one body and one soul but in two persons " (Balsamon). That idea is based upon a Biblical text : " In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made He him ; male and female created He them ; and blessed them, and called their name Adam, in the day when they were created " (Gen. v. 1, 2).

Man : that is the husband and the wife ; that is the Androgynon of Paradise, who had neither polarity nor repulsive energy, but only constant attraction and unity by the force of Eros. Woman was created to be a help : now St. Augustine (*cf.* Troitzky, *op. cit.*, pp. 42, 43) remarks that man is more useful to man as a help than woman is. It would be more exact to translate, not " *help* " but " *complement* " : the Bible does not say " It is not good to *work* alone " but " to *be* alone " ; it does not say " who will *work* with him " but " who will *be* with him ". " Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife : and they shall be one flesh " (Gen. ii., 24). " Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh " (Matt. xix. 6).

All these texts show the supra-personal unity of the two in one.

We find in St. John Chrysostom a remarkable commentary on these words together with a very profound conception of love in marriage : " He who is not bound by the bonds of marriage represents in himself not integrality but only halfness. Man and woman are not two beings but a single being." " The properties of love are such that the lover and the beloved form not two separate beings but one being." That supra-personal unity, which is rooted in Christ, is the application of one of the higher laws of the spiritual world — the law of Trinitarian unity. The man who is " alone " in the metaphysical sense of the word (it is not good that the man should be alone), he who lives only with himself and by himself, easily comes to find the centre of being in himself, to make the universe revolve about his person.

In the religious life, humility can conquer that egocentricity. Humility is a free act tending to conquer that " halfness ", to transpose the centre of being from self to God ; theocentricity is a real victory of the spirit, the transition from love of self to love of God. In real humility, man becomes not weak but spiritually strong. The acquisition of true humility is always bound up with the state of love, with Eros. The human self arises and in its flight embraces the non-self, inserts it into itself. " It is no longer I that live... " And at the same time, it is not I that live, but all the world, all humanity that lives in me. The love which is rooted in God transcends its own limits, is no longer able to keep back the invading flood of waves of love towards God, and by that love embraces the whole cosmos. Everything which has a true value in the spiritual world is stamped with a supra-personal character. The whole Fourth Gospel expresses that idea in different passages : I and the Father are one.

Everything which exists bears the sign of the heavenly Logos, the mystery of the Trinity in one single God. The sacred number of the Holy Trinity signifies the ultimate fullness. (The Devil, on the contrary, is separation, isola-

tion). The aim of being is to conquer isolation (it is not good for man to be alone).

The Trinity as fullness is the spiritual foundation of the life of the world, and is its supreme solution; it is thus that the Christological principle of the unity of the two natures in Christ is bound up with the Trinitarian principle. It is in Him that it finds its crown and its perfect revelation. Without a third element, without the God-Man, the solitude of man separated from God would have been an eternal sorrow. Marriage means precisely this: to come out of one's isolation, to meet one another in a third, in God; in Him the lovers find their aim, the unfolding of their being. The supra-personal unity of two and the realization of human personality are revealed in God. In that unity the personality is not lost — any more than it is by the fact that we become members of the Church.

When in the Kingdom we shall become members of the Body of the Glorified Christ, that process will be a supreme affirmation of our spiritual and corporeal personality. Marriage is not an "isolation for two", a collective solitude, it is the meeting of two in Christ; and in Christ all is inward, and all is one.

The isolation, the state of separation of the sexes is surmounted in marriage.

According to the higher spiritual laws, true love embraces all the world: God is Love. The Holy Trinity is the sublime image of Unity. In marriage one can grasp the mystery of the supra-natural unity. The husband and the wife acquire Christ and are embraced by Him; they touch experimentally the Trinitarian dogma. "God unites thee to thy wife" says St. John Chrysostom. "When husband and wife unite in marriage, they appear, not as the image of something inanimate or something terrestrial, but as the image of God Himself." "Where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them." St. Clement of Alexandria applies these words to marriage. The creation of man was a consequence of the fullness of the Trinitarian life of God. The Divine Love creates the object of its fullness, of its love. In marriage, man lives the fullness

of being. The phenomenon of love is bound up with the idea of man as an integral being. Its fullness brims over, seeks its object in the world, and engenders the man-child. When the child is born, "she remembereth no more the anguish, for joy that a man is born into the world" (John xvi. 21).

The Christian Home: the "Little Church"

St. Clement of Alexandria applies to conjugal love the Gospel Word: "Where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them" (Matt. xviii. 20); for such a union is ideally a Church, a part of the Body of Christ (Eph. v.).

For St. John Chrysostom, the conjugal home is "the little Church". There is more here than the habitual conception of the symbol. The symbolism of Holy Scripture, that of the Parables is not at all fortuitous; it reveals a correspondence between the realities of the spiritual world and those of the temporal world; there is here a real bond, a similitude of rhythm and measure; the one world and the other are the expression of a single plan of the Creator. The family is an integral part of the Church; at the same time it is a symbol of it.

The first miracle of Christ in the spiritual Gospel, the Fourth, took place at Cana during a marriage. Is that by chance? No. The miracle of Cana is bound up with the life of the Church in the spiritual elements which it contains: expiation, the Eucharist. The water and the wine symbolize the outpouring of the blood and the water on the Cross (John xix. 34).

But that symbolical miracle is produced during a marriage; and the transformation of the water into wine is the great symbol of the elevation of marriage. The water (symbol in the Old Testament of purification and penitence) is transformed into wine (the juice of the grape, the blood of the earth of the ancient mysteries — the Sacrament of the Eucharist, pledge of Eternal Life). The passions are transformed into Eros. "This beginning of miracles did Jesus in Cana of Galilee, and manifested forth His glory" (John ii. 11).

The Church is founded upon the faith of the Apostles. In the spiritual Gospel, faith is engendered by the glory of the miracle worked at the marriage of Cana. The miracle worked in the domestic *ecclesia* lays the primary foundation of the *Ecclesia* of Christ. The little Church is ontologically linked up with the great Church.

In every conjugal union, according to St. Gregory, Christ is venerated in the husband and the Church in the wife. Holy Scripture makes use of the terms of conjugal life to speak of the relation of God and Israel, of Christ and the Church ; and that is not by chance, for these symbols translate an ontological reality.

Marriage, according to St. John Chrysostom, is a mysterious representation of the Church (Eph. ii. 22 ; Hebr. iii. 6).

The activity of the Church is called edification, the building of the house. The Greek name of the Church signifies House of the Lord, Father's House. That appellation is very profound, for it is really the House of God ; it is here that the Lord is present, that the great mystery of Christ and the Church takes place. The husband is the image of Christ, the wife is the image of the Church. The notion of the royal priesthood enables us to grasp better the profound meaning of that symbolism.

Bucharev, in commenting upon the words of the Apocalypse : " Unto Him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in His own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and His Father ; to Him be glory and dominion . . . " and those of St. Peter : " But ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a peculiar people ; that ye should shew forth the praises of Him who hath called you out of darkness into His marvellous light ", throws out the idea that the grace of the priesthood is bound up with sacrifice. All Christians have the grace of the royal priesthood in this sense, that all are called to hold themselves before the Heavenly Father and to offer Him in Christ the sacrifice of their thoughts, their actions, their feelings, their researches.

Such a process of " Christification " of the world extends the sphere of the Incarnation ; each of us is called to renounce himself, to receive Christ and to recognize Him in others.

We then discern the *ikon* (image) of God under the thick veil of sin. The true *ikon* of God being His Son, it is by confessing and acknowledging that Presence of the Son that we offer Him the only Sacrifice acceptable to Him. That Sacrifice makes man the collaborator of Grace in the struggle against Antichrist; it unites all the creative activity of man, including the creation of man himself, of his life, of his holiness.

According to Bucharev, all the ecclesiastical hierarchy serves to make the universal grace of the royal priesthood act in the midst of all the people of God. The word of the Apostle Paul "to win Christ" expresses the essence of that grace. The different gifts of the royal priesthood correspond to the different forms of human life.

Marriage is the meeting-point of those who love one another in God. It reflects the fullness of the heavenly Trinitarian Being and at the same time the fullness of the Church — the terrestrial being in God.

If the royal priesthood is applicable to the whole life of the Church member, it is invested in marriage with special forms, which find their expression in the symbolism of the Apostle Paul. The husband bears the real grace of the domestic priesthood, of the family ministry, just as the wife bears the special grace of sacerdotal motherhood, of maternal protection.

The *ikon* of the Mother of God bearing the Infant Jesus is an image of Motherhood. The worship of the Mother of God is bound up with the veneration of the Church. That worship has a profound significance; it reveals to the world the vocation of motherhood and the charism of maternal protection and succour.

There are more and more isolated, suffering, lost beings in the world. It is time for the Christian home to manifest its true nature, for the domestic Church to reveal itself as a force of compassion and succour in an anguished world. Every meeting in Christ (including friendship) is creative; it introduces into a new atmosphere, modifies personalities; and that change necessarily reacts upon the external world.

Children are the object upon which the conjugal fullness

naturally and logically outpours itself. In the sterile marriage there should not however be any turning in upon self. The spiritual rhythm demands that the Eros should not limit itself to an egocentricity for two; and it is by obeying that rhythm that it will prove its fullness. The external object upon which that fullness will outpour itself may be found in other forms of life, and above all in an active participation in the life of the great family which is the Church. The children will be replaced by direct or indirect adoption. The absence of a child may be replaced by spiritual child-birth, by spiritual parenthood; and perhaps it belongs especially to sterile unions to manifest the royal priesthood of marriage in the work of giving protection and succour to abandoned or suffering beings.

Eros and Agapé

ROLAND DE PURY

Agapé, the expression which the Bible employs to designate love, signifies on the one hand the love of God and on the other, in response, that of man for God and for his brethren. The basis of *Agapé* is this: We love Him, because He first loved us. We must be disciples of the Lord in order to be able to love one another. Without the knowledge of the love of God, no *Agapé* is possible among men. Charity is not a possibility of human nature, the highest summit which we can scale. It is by faith alone (that is, by the knowledge of the love of God) that we receive the possibility of it. It is by faith alone that we can act in charity.

Agapé is the power of God acting here and there in the action of a man; it is the fruit of the Spirit. It can mean on man's side only sacrifice, death to self.

Eros, on the contrary, signifies the greatest power of human nature, the deepest motive force of our actions, the desire to possess and to be possessed by another. It is striking that paganism made a god of it. If *Eros* is a god,

that shows that it is sufficient for itself, that it can exist and subsist by itself. All the pagan gods express what man can do without God. It is by nature that we act in Eros. Eros suffices for Eros. Agapé, on the contrary, never at any moment suffices for itself or subsists by itself. God alone suffices for Agapé, because His presence alone make its possible. It is the meeting-point of two human beings in God.

In speaking of Eros in these pages, we have no intention at all of giving it a depreciatory sense, of reducing it to a mere sensuality. We are speaking, not of eroticism, but of the great total desire which man and woman have for one another body and soul, of that impossibility for a man and a woman who have met of conceiving of their future physical and spiritual life without each other. I am thinking of Tristan and Isolde, of Ise and Mésa in the *Parlage de Midi*, of Stephen and Deborah in the *Flèche d'Or*, much more than of Don Juan or Casanova. That does not prevent Eros from remaining entirely a reality of *this* world, the highest *natural* phenomenon of man, while Agapé is a reality of the *other* world. Eros means the most complete meeting of two beings on this side of death. Agapé means their miraculous meeting beyond death, the meeting of those "who are born, not of the will of the flesh, or of the will of man, but of God" (John i. 13).

Eros and Agapé thus belong to radically different planes ; and the whole task of the Christian in this domain seems to me to be to guard against confusing them, which would be to confuse God and man. "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, that which is born of the Spirit is Spirit." No human power can enable us to pass from one to the other. Between Eros and Agapé there is no other passage than faith in the resurrection of the dead, the presence of the living God. Eros could not be the substructure of Agapé, nor Agapé the prolongation of Eros, any more than eternal life prolongs temporal life.

The concern of the Christian is to know the limit of all the domains of his life. That is the concern of *temperance* : to know the limit of labour, the limit of politics, the limit of the family, the limit — in a word — of all the things of this

world : *a fortiori*, the limit of Eros. That last is no easy task ; for, by very reason of the extraordinary violence of the feelings and sensations of the erotic life, we are all inclined either to *worship* or to *suspect* it.

The exaltation, the divinization of Eros is paganism. Man seeks his deliverance, his redemption, in himself in a direct way. Eros is here a god or rather a demonic possession ; for *Eros is a demon only when he is a god*. But I shall not dwell upon that ; for the direct worship of Eros is not a danger within the Church.

The suspicion of Eros is then the great danger for the Church. It is an undeniable fact that many " Christians " consider the domain of Eros as that of sin, and dare not think of it without pangs of conscience. They are indeed prepared to believe that God created man. But it is the Devil, they think, who made him male and female. The signs of this suspicion are numerous. People are very little disturbed by the fact that someone is miserly, untruthful, covetous and even unbelieving, if everything is in order " on that point ". Books are judged in the same way. As for parents, they conduct themselves with their children on this subject as if it were a shameful domain, impossible to touch upon naturally, which must be disguised by good-wives' tales — a procedure which has the result of terrorizing those with tender consciences and transforming in others a natural instinct into a kind of taste for vice.

But the gravest thing is not so much that suspicion in itself as its religious consequence, which is an indirect worhsip offered to Eros, a Christian paganism. To suspect Eros has nearly always as its result, by reason of repression, a religion with an erotic basis, a natural theology or a mystical experience remarkably coloured by the power of the sexual desire. Those who do not accord to Eros the place which the Creator assigns to it (unless that be by a particular vocation according to Matt. xix. 12), run a grave risk, in their further relations with God and with other men, of taking for Agapé that which is only Eros, an Eros infinitely well disguised and transfigured, an Eros which knows how to take its revenge. This fact was accredited in the Church when people

began to talk of the *sublimation* of Eros. That expression, which makes one shudder, is the acknowledgment of the indirect worship which Christian paganism agrees to render to human nature. That acknowledgment is, besides, infinitely valuable; for it shows that modern Protestantism, just like Catholic mysticism, is in fact nothing but a sublimated Eros, an Eros prolonged into Agapé. That is of infinite gravity; and it will never be possible to say enough concerning the ravages of such sublimations throughout the whole history of the Church. For the religious sublimation of Eros, the basis of liberalism and of mysticism, consists in doing what a believer ought to guard against doing: trespassing the limit, seeking in God an enjoyment which He forbids to be sought in the "world", letting Eros penetrate into territory which is forbidden, since "flesh and blood shall not inherit the Kingdom of God".

Let us then say that a Christian may and must accept Eros as Eros, and simply *not* as sublimated Eros. For *Eros is not sin: sin is the sublimation of Eros*. The flesh is sinful, not as flesh, but as sublimated flesh which bears the name of grace and refuses to recognize its limits. Eros is sin as soon as it desires to pass itself off as Agapé.

That is what threatens the Church far more than the direct divinization of Eros in paganism. That is what brings about diabolical confusions at the heart of the Church: one may observe the same very pious people who confuse Eros more or less with sin transposing it unconsciously into a domain where it becomes for them a source of divine experiences and insights, without suspecting that by that very fact Eros has effectively become their sin. We do not wish to say that all those who sublimate Eros suspect it; but it is certain that nearly all those who suspect it sublimate it under other names and steep themselves in it again with a calmed conscience.

What is certain is that any way to lead us to God other than Him who said "I am the Way" is sin in its most dangerous form, its religious form, idolatry. Eros thus separates us from God and men as soon as, by its conscious or unconscious sublimation, it desires to be our way to God and

to men. That is why it is so important for the Christian man and woman to know the rightful place of Eros, in order to keep from any suspicion regarding it as well as from any sublimation, in order to guard against Eros' taking the place of Agapé for them and in any way replacing the Holy Spirit.

If we have had to mark the difference of the orders, it is time to see what is the relation in conjugal life between Eros and Agapé. If a man and wife are believers, that is to say, if their life together is in Christ, God, as He is thus their Redeemer, gives them the command of Agapé. And that means that they have in a quite special way to be one another's neighbour, to love one another in Christ, to forgive one another as God forgives them, to bear with one another as God bears with them. They have to know that they are lost and found again, and to know it, not only each for himself, but each for the other : that is to say that they have in all their thoughts and words to exercise mercy towards one another. That is the commandment of the redeeming God. That is the light which the promise of eternal life must cause to shine upon the life of the partners.

That, however, is not the specific character of Christian marriage. For marriage belongs to the natural order, to the order of creation and not to that of redemption. A marriage is not Christian because the partners have their life in Christ. It is not at all sufficient that the man and wife should love one another in Christ. A marriage is Christian only when the partners recognize in the power of the *desire* which unites them a commandment and a gift of the *Creator* (That is possible only to those whose life is in Christ, for it is only in Christ that we know our Creator). When God is in Christ our Redeemer, then He is also in Christ our Creator. When He is Lord of our eternal life, He is Lord also of our temporal life. When the Redeemer gives the partners the command of Agapé, the Creator gives them the command of Eros. The man " shall cleave unto his wife ; and they twain shall be one flesh ".

But we have seen that the absence of Agapé signifies the divinity of Eros. Eros alone cannot keep its place. That is why, although the basis of every marriage may be Eros in its fullest sense, a Christian marriage cannot be founded on

Eros without Agapé. For, because of sin, Eros without Agapé sublimates itself and becomes god. And at the confines of that divinized Eros there is satiety, neglect and disappointment. The moment always comes when Eros is a dead god, for the gods have a short life¹ and their tomb is pure nothingness. Whereas charity never faileth, because it is the fruit of the Holy Spirit, the act of man for man in presence of the Eternal, the act of man as new-born of God. When a man and wife have received in Christ the revelation of Agapé which is renunciation of oneself, they know for the first time where Eros stands, they are for the first time its masters and no longer its servants, and they understand that Eros is a part of those things which are *added* to those who seek *first* the Kingdom of God and His righteousness. Eros is then no longer a god, a dead god, but the most beautiful gift of the Creator, the most living power of the creation (Of the *first* creation, however. Here remains the limit, the "no" which weighs upon Eros. "In the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage" : Mark xii. 25 ; I Cor. vii. 1,29).

In this domain, as elsewhere, the whole Christian life is determined by the word : Thankfulness. It is necessary to know whether Eros is for us a subject of desire, of bad conscience, of disappointment, of mystic exaltation — or a subject of thankfulness. "Bless the Lord, o my soul, and forget not all His benefits." Eros is sin if it is not for us one of these benefits.

If Eros could not be sanctified by the Lord, why should the most beautiful song of erotic love be found just in the Bible ? Why could we read there :

*"How fair and how pleasant
Art thou, O love, for delights !
This thy stature is like to a palm tree,
And thy breasts to clusters of grapes.
I said, "I will go up to the palm tree,
I will take hold of the boughs thereof"...*

¹ See the remarkable story "*En mer*" in "*La Nuit*" by Bounine. See also "*Adam et Eve*" by Ramuz.

*I am my beloved's,
And his desire is toward me.
Come, my beloved, let us go forth into the field;
Let us lodge in the villages.
Let us get up early to the vineyards...
There will I give thee my loves."*

(Song of Solomon vii. 6-8, 10-12).

It even seems at the end of the book that the two planes of Eros and Agapé are confounded :

*Set me as a seal upon thine heart...
For love is strong as death;
Passion is unconquerable as the grave,
Its flames are flames of fire,
The devouring fire of the Lord.*

(I think with other translators that it is better to understand : a flame of the Lord (*lit.* a fire of Yahweh-flame), that is, a flame given, accorded by the Lord).

We do not wish to trouble here to find out the extent to which the Song of Songs as a song of erotic love may or must be considered as a parable of Divine love. For there are other famous passages in the Bible where the relations of man and woman are given directly as the image of the relations of God with man (Ezek. xvii. ; Hosea ; Ephes. v.). In that case, must it not be concluded, contrarily to our preceding assertions, that Eros can lead us to Agapé, that Eros is a beginning of Agapé, and that our natural power leads us without interruption to the Kingdom of God ?

That would be a misunderstanding of the meaning of the parables in the Bible. Erotic love can indeed be a parable of Divine Love ; but that does not mean that man can pass from Eros to Agapé. The Biblical parables can be understood first of all only from above downwards, and not from below upwards. I mean by that that it is the Kingdom of God which explains the parables to us, and not the parables which explain the Kingdom of God to us, or, better still : A parable makes the Kingdom of God understandable only to those to

whom the Kingdom of God has already made that parable understandable. The parables give only to those who have (Mark iv. 11).

Likewise, Eros can serve as an image of Agapé only to those who already know in Agapé the meaning and the limit of Eros. Eros can represent Divine Love as the grain of mustard seed the Kingdom of God. It does not become Agapé any more than the grain of mustard seed becomes the Kingdom. The difference of kind stands fast. The parable does not in any way justify the mystical prolongation of Eros, its removal into the order of grace. The parable does not at all diminish the radical distinction of the two orders, and does not remove the prohibition of sublimations.

When it is a subject of praise to God, when it is not sought first but received in obedience, Eros becomes more and more, and without limitation, that which it ought to be : the unity of two creatures in the difference of their sex. The unity grows up in and with the difference, so that man is truly man only by woman and for woman, and woman truly woman only by man and for man.

Between life-partners (and I speak only of such, because from the mere point of view of the erotic, it is to speak childishly to believe it possible between a man and a woman who conceive any other limit than death to their union) guarded by the Agapé of Christ, Eros grows with the patience of a tree. They do not perhaps see it growing, but when they turn round and look some years back, they must recognize that then it was only a little tree ! To the partners who are His children, God can grant Eros in a greater, fuller, surer measure than the god Eros could to his worshippers. And when one sees, especially throughout modern literature, with what a desperate fever men cling to Eros, one cannot keep from saying with Psalm cxxvii. : " It is vain for you to rise up early, to sit up late, to eat the bread of sorrows : for God giveth as much to His beloved during their sleep ".

The immense happiness which man and woman can receive body and soul from one another, the tenderness, the intimacy, the pleasure which year by year bind them more closely to one another (and not only the children which are

always mentioned here) are the necessary signs of the Divine blessing which rests upon their marriage. Thus their human love is *sanctified*, which is the reverse of *sublimated*, and which here means : set by God in the provisional order of His first Creation.

An American Viewpoint

WILLIAM E. KROLL

Just how far this paper may be taken as a *characteristic* American viewpoint and how much it is only a personal philosophy to which other observers could not subscribe, must remain an open question. I can only express at the outset my own awareness that to be more authentic it should come as a symposium rather than as an individual presentation, for the obvious reason that America is both too vast geographically and too diverse culturally to permit any single sample of opinion to pass as representative of the whole on *any* important question ; and for the further reason that, on a matter so close to human life as that of the relationships between men and women, no one, however wide his experience, can possibly write as objectively as he should. So that what is offered here must be taken with due respect to its limitations : it is simply the situation as one individual sees it from his own little window, in the pastorate of an eastern, urbanized section of the country, and after a comparatively short experience with college and high-school students and with younger married couples.

While the present finds us still in the midst of an era of far-reaching social change, the ultimate settling-point of which is as yet so largely a matter of speculation, it is possible, I think, to distinguish one or two fairly definite shifts that have taken place in our attitude toward sex matters in the past generation, as well as to discern certain trends which opinion now seems to be taking. Looking back in these ominous "pre-War" days upon what we used to call the post-War

years, and comparing them with the original pre-War era, we in America witnessed, a decade or so ago, the climax of a revolt against what is now classically designated as a Puritanical attitude toward sex matters. The custom in those older days was to avoid anything like a frank and open discussion of such things both at home and, except in a sporadic way, even in college classrooms or at student conferences. It was a matter that was taboo, surrounded more or less with an atmosphere of false sanctity. The result was that many of our young people came up to the marriage altar often without adequate knowledge or, what was worse, with spurious information on this important subject, and frequently with emotional attitudes, especially among young women, that were characterized most by fear.

It was right, then, that this older prudishness should go, and that sex questions should be met without the hypocrisy of false modesty, and faced as the more natural fact of human life that they are. But, whether because of the World War with its inevitable lowering of moral levels everywhere among men, or because of our peculiar American propensity for moving from one extreme to another, we swung to a point where frankness of attitude on sex matters degenerated into something of an obsession, and where, in some quarters, just about every legitimate vestige of the sacredness of the subject was rather completely flouted. We passed through a period when not alone did discussion become unwholesomely bald and common but when practical experimentation also took on a rather loose rein. This was our little period of trial and companionate marriages built so uncertainly upon the sands of the notion that all that was necessary to a happy wedded life was "complete physical sexual adjustment" — with a necessary trial-and-error period beforehand to ascertain this adjustment. I do not mean that there was anything approaching universality about this more extreme attitude and practice. I do mean to emphasize the fact, however, that it reached proportions where many of our young people came to know far more about sex before they left the high-school than was good for them, and when the whole matter was unequivocally and rankly overdone.

In more recent years, however, the pendulum has been swinging back again ; and we seem today to be nearing a more sober balance, in which sex questions will still be handled realistically and honestly, as they should be, but at the same time with the moderation and the delicacy which they also deserve. Our younger parents are dealing with the matter with their children more and more upon this open basis, and with what might be called a casualness which leaves their youngsters realizing that while sex has an important place in life, it is not the whole of it. They are answering their children's questions as they arise, with an unemotional simplicity that promises for the coming generation a healthier attitude, free from emotional upset but at the same time reminded of the need of self-restraint, and of something at least a bit sacred, in this field ; while among our college and other young people the subject has likewise assumed a correspondingly secondary place in open discussion by comparison with what it had a few years ago.

These, then, among our recent changes and trends in America, will, I think, meet with general agreement among most observers, as representing broadly yet definitely the background against which any further word of appraisal must be made. There are still many noteworthy exceptions to the rule : — parents, especially fathers, who are still strangely afraid to discuss sex questions with their children, and young people who still enter upon married life ill equipped and left to learn for themselves. And there still survives a fringe of more radical experimentalists who would taste all that life has to offer before time has ripened the occasion. Likewise, our public discussions of birth-control and the availability of contraceptive devices have not made it easy for many in these days of postponed marriage to deny the question : " Why wait ? " But, by and large, the total scene today, in contrast either with that before the War or with those hectic years which followed, is a scene that has more of a rainbow over it than a cloud.

But to look now more critically at our situation (and here I venture quite consciously upon a personal philosophy), it may be said that what our general temper lacks most today

in this whole field is basically the same thing that we so sorely need in most of our other great areas of unsolved social difficulty, — namely and simply *a larger unselfishness among men, of a kind that is fostered most by the things of the Spirit*. As a nation we are back again, so to speak, upon the right track : the way that holds monogamy as its ideal and a happy marriage with mutual fidelity and children as its goal. We are persuaded, as even Russia now seems to be, that no people can flout the institution of the home without doing something vitally harmful to their own well-being as a nation ; that as the family goes in society so will society itself go. But the track has also an upward grade — or ought to have ; and we are not climbing it either very fast or very far. There remains among us unrecovered out of the “ Puritanical ” age a spiritual note to all that sex signifies ; and our desires linger too blindly over its materialistic aspects. Too much of the conception of love held by our young people, as well as by many who are older, is of the stuff that comes out of Hollywood, the worst of which is not its bawdiness but its gross selfishness, having for its theme song : “ You belong to me and I belong to you ”. And, as a consequence of some years of this influence, we are today mill-stoned with countless marriages and homes whose members are living so completely as though they belong only to each other that their capacity for social responsibility seldom gets far beyond their own respective firesides.

That such a condition should thus reflect itself upon the larger screen of our total national life, leaving our great economic and other social ills crying out as they are just now for more men of vision, would seem to be inevitable. But the further tragedy of it all is that this condition is reacting upon the very home life of these same families. Married persons, that is, committed only to the ideal of living for each other, instead of making the home the training-ground that it should be and once was for the cultivation of a larger social consciousness among its members, are demonstrating that with such selfish ends their own capacity for caring *even for each other* is being starved down, until these persons have come to care ultimately only for their individual selves.

Perhaps that is why our divorce rate refuses to come down — not because of physical sexual maladjustment as much as because of the false premise upon which the marriage union has so commonly been based, that a man and a woman can find lasting happiness only by living for each other and for their own children. It is that the great Christian word “love”, given such lofty content in days when Religion was more real than it is today, has been pulled down and unwittingly accepted at its lower levels by so many of our people. And it is that the older, nobler concept of this word, as well as its practice, needs to be regenerated among us, both for the sake of society and for the sake of what it will add all along the scale of separate relationships between men and women. As one of our eminent preachers has expressed it : “ Love (in the New Testament sense) is not a pool which becomes shallow as it spreads, but an ocean which gains depth and vastness as it moves away from its shores. Let a man and a woman who care greatly for each other begin to care for much else besides, developing an intelligent and unselfish interest in world affairs, and they will discover as year follows year that they are caring more for each other and that, through a common devotion to something greater than self, they are developing a union of selves which nothing on earth can destroy and which, they may hope and believe, not even death can dissolve. ”

Such a note falls today too generally upon deaf ears among us. And it may soberly be asked whether it will ever be heard, whether it has in the past ever been achieved, apart from the spiritual well-springs of Religion. We ministers know quite well how many young couples we have married in the past decade, who turned to the Church on their wedding day only to turn away again afterwards to their more worldly pursuits. Religion has not loomed very large as a necessity after the blessing of the wedding-day. And we know too, how many couples of this same sort whose marital difficulties it has been our lot to share in these same years, could find “ life’s riddle and life’s key ” if their binding force were more of the kind of love that gains depth and vastness as it moves away from its own shores.

So I say that our deepest need, both among young people who are dreaming their dreams of love and marriage today and among parents who, looking that far ahead for their children, are eager to lay for them the right sort of groundwork of preparation, is a need that only the social vision and the inspirations of Religion can supply adequately. And I should feel more inclined to believe that this observation may be colored by the wishful thinking of a professional religionist whose own vision is at fault, were it not for the fact other observers here too, who cannot possibly be charged with religious one-sidedness, are saying much the same thing.

To take a significant example, there has just appeared among our books a volume called *The Return To Religion*, written by the director of a large psychological service center in New York City. The author's personal religious background is a typical one of a kind with which we over here are quite familiar: — an extremely heavy dose of orthodox Religion in his early youth; then a college career which riddled and demolished his ideas without putting anything positive in their place; and so, the result, as the author himself puts it, of "a complete and powerfully fortified agnostic" who turned his back on the Church and regarded himself as emancipated from Religion. But now, at the age of 45, after 15 years as a practising psychologist during which he has examined more than 4000 individuals many of whom came with problems of marital unhappiness, this man has not only decided to return to the Church and Religion himself, but has been freely prescribing the same treatment for many of his patients.

And it is illuminating to read some of the more specific things this practitioner has to say about love and marriage: — that "character and unselfish personality and the many good habits they involve are far more important than the details of sex"; that "the emphasis on sex has distracted attention from the more important meaning of marriage"; that "we cannot demand success in marriage any more than in any other phase of life, we must achieve it"; that "the achievement of a happy marriage begins in childhood"; and that "as in the preparation for marriage, so in its happy

conclusion, the traits of an unselfish personality are of highest importance ". And then, referring to the results of an intensive study of the factors affecting the success of marriage, made by certain other psychologists, in which 116 divorced couples and 346 married couples were given a series of tests, this writer says that " outstanding among their findings was the fact that the divorced (women, particularly) were more unstable emotionally, more introverted, and were little given to social service, " uplift " interests, and " causes " generally ". Summarizing the results in homely terms, the happily married were the more unselfish, whereas the divorced were the more selfish.

Well, we have had not a few practising psychologists, as well as others dealing with individual human problems, who have in recent years been offering much the same sort of testimony out of their experience with people. Physicians, lawyers and even business men have from time to time added their contribution to this same stream of observation. But only very recently have they been tending to associate the solution of the problem with Religion. Only lately have they been pausing to ask whether through Science alone there can be any cure, either for our larger social ills or for what we call the more individual difficulties of personality adjustment, or whether, as someone has put it, the cure will be found " only as the sciences are subordinated to a religious belief in certain values of life which are fundamental ".

And is this " return " to Religion finding its way down among men below the upper levels of thought and observation ? Are married people who themselves have been having difficulty, as well as others who have come to feel that there are some things more important to a happy relationship between men and women than the details of sex, — have these likewise begun to suspect that Religion is the way out ? Well, there have been other ministers in the last six years who proclaimed confidently that a great religious revival would arise out of the midst of this depression ; and it has not come. Yet there are a few very definite and quite promising signs on the horizon just now that our general life as a people has quietly been growing more sober and thought-

ful, and that in the same unnoticed fashion our social consciousness has been raising its level. And there are many ministers who are saying that Church interest and attendance in the last year or two have taken a turn among not a few of our older young people, those especially who have been married for several years and have children of their own, and that scattered throughout this group of "prodigals" are those who only a little while back had regarded Religion as having had its day and ceased to be. Beyond this, for my own part, I would venture no further predictions. I would merely add my humble, personal conviction that there can never be, because there has never been, anything like a full discovery of the many fine and beautiful things which relationships between the sexes can yield to men and women, without the discovery that it is, as Herbert Gray once chose to put it, a partnership of "Men, Women — and God".

THE EDITOR'S TRAVEL DIARY

Ordination

It is the purpose of this Diary to speak of things seen and heard in and around the World's Student Christian Federation rather than of things which happen to its author personally. But sometimes this distinction becomes artificial and one cannot help writing about more personal matters.

Thus my ordination, which took place on the last Sunday in March, while representing a decisive step for me personally, seemed to have also a bearing upon Federation life. Pierre Maury, who preached the sermon, Charles Westphal and several of the other ordaining pastors participated in the double capacity of representatives of the Church and of fellow-workers in the Federation. And in the statement which I had to present giving the reasons for my desire to be ordained, I tried to explain that, apart from my personal desire to be a servant of the Church rather than a sort of free-lance, I considered my ordination as a confirmation of the relationship which the Federation would like to see established between the Church and itself.

In these last years we have become acutely aware of the necessity of a new conception of the Christian Community, and we have often spoken of the Federation as a pioneering body for that Community. At the same time we have discovered that our oecumenical task is not simply to bring individual students of different confessions together on what may be called neutral ground, but rather to help them to become workers in their own Churches for the restoration of the Church Universal. These new insights and convictions can, however, be implemented only if we turn to the concrete Churches and try collectively and individually to find our place in the actual life of the Church. This does not mean a change in our organizational position, but it does mean a realization that our task is part and parcel of the task of the larger inclusive Christian Community, and that we are to share fully in its struggles and victories.

The Federation and other International Student Organizations

The annual meeting of the seven main international student organizations held under the auspices of the International Institute of Intellectual Collaboration left the impression that, in spite of international tension and in spite of the increasing influence of the ultra-nationalist movements in the student world, these organizations are holding their own. This is partly due to the fact that most of them work in the more technical realms in which international misunderstanding makes itself less easily felt than in the realm of convictions and ideas. For the same reason the tendency of these annual meetings has so far been to deal with the organizational aspect of problems of international collaboration, which to our Federation are by no means the most important. If we could use these unique opportunities of meeting together as representatives of the most diverse tendencies in student life for a frank discussion of our fundamental convictions, they would be of far greater value to all of us.

I therefore made the proposal that our inter-organizational committee should arrange for small conferences or "entretiens" to which some representatives of the main tendencies, not otherwise represented in our midst, should be invited. These conferences should of course not try to formulate any common conclusions, but should help us to arrive at a clear diagnosis of present tendencies of thought in the universities and at a better comprehension of each other's standpoint. The proposal was sympathetically received; and it is hoped that the various authorities of the League will give the necessary permission to carry it out. It will be a difficult undertaking, for there is no common basis of discussion upon which all these groups would be willing to take their stand; but, if it succeeds, it will at least help to break down that dangerous isolation

in which so many of our student organizations live today, and enable us all to be more intelligent and fairer in our judgment of each other.

"Faith and Order"

The Executive Committee Meeting of "Faith and Order", which was held at "Woudschoten" in Holland, was largely occupied with the preparations for the second "Faith and Order" World Conference, which will meet next year in Edinburgh.

It is not easy to visualize that conference. The very fact that it will be the second conference of its kind will make it very different in character from the Lausanne Conference of 1927: less of a spectacular event and less of an occasion for discovery. In this case it is definitely not true that the first step is the most difficult, for the significance of the first conference consisted in the very fact of its coming together, that is in its being a new approach to Unity. But "Edinburgh" will only be justified if it leads to some slight progress, not necessarily in preparing for concrete acts of unity, but at least in showing in what direction we should travel to arrive at real unity.

Will the Edinburgh Conference be able to do that? As one looks at the present oecumenical situation, at the amazing ignorance of many Church leaders regarding other Churches than their own, and at the rather inadequate preparations for the Conference (inadequate in that preparations consist largely in drawing up a catalogue of standpoints rather than in thinking together about the really divisive issues), one dare not be optimistic about the possibilities of this meeting.

"Faith and Order" will invite some fifty younger theologians, largely drawn from the present and former membership of the Federation, to attend the Conference. For this we should be grateful, and we should make full use of this opportunity to be brought face to face with oecumenical realities. For the fifty who will come it will and should not be a nice holiday, for they will often be tempted to lose patience with the older generation, or even to despair of the cause of Church Unity. But if they are willing to endure and to learn, it may become for them a period of schooling in oecumenical knowledge. It cannot be said too often that, unless our generation produces Church leaders who have both a sense of calling and a basis of thorough knowledge in the oecumenical field, there can be no progress toward Church Unity. If "Edinburgh 1937" helps to produce that leadership, that result alone would make it thoroughly worth while.

Fourth Centenary of the Reformation at Geneva

Celebrations of the great events in Church history are bound to leave mixed impressions. One cannot help asking whether the persons whose work is being recalled would themselves approve of the way in which their spiritual children honour their memory. And it is not often that the children succeed in their celebrations of the fathers in such a way that they make their real spirit come alive.

What would Calvin have said of the Geneva Jubilee? He would certainly have used some of the strongest expressions of his rich vocabulary about many of the speeches which glorified the man Calvin, the system to which his name is attached, the little republic which he created or the visible results of his work in the wider world. But he would certainly have been glad to hear the courageous message of the Reformed representatives of the Confessional Church of Germany; he would have enjoyed hearing the affirmation that "there is no Calvinism", and that the only way of being true to his spirit is to re-discover again and again the Revelation of God in the Bible and to let ourselves be bound by it. And he would have been glad about the fact that the jubilee was not merely an affair of Church leaders, but rather of the Christian people of Geneva. The evening in the Cathedral when more than two thousand people came to the communion-table, the procession of many thousands of young people which ended up with a simple but meaningful ceremony before the Reformation Monument, these things showed that Geneva is not, or is no longer, so estranged from the things for which Calvin stood as most of us had often thought. If one looks at the younger generation — both theologians and laymen — in this city, one cannot doubt that the next celebration will be even more a celebration in the spirit of Calvin himself. It is not that they are mere traditionalists, but they know, like many of the younger Lutherans in Germany and Sweden, and many of the younger Anglicans in Great Britain, that there is a force in the older tradition of their Church which transcends the force of any more recent and different tradition, and they would use that older tradition as a starting point, not as a point of arrival.

May I tell one frivolous story which in my mind will always be connected with the Jubilee? Just before Karl Barth was to speak at the solemn academical session, and while he was sitting in our garden, my children brought him their most cherished treasures, two little turtles, and put them on top of the manuscript which he was to read. The turtles did something which is natural to animals in moments of great anxiety, and thus "spoiled the notes which the gentleman is to sing in the Church" as my youngest son put it. Was it the revenge of nature against the greatest of all enemies of natural theology? V. 'T H.

THE STUDENT WORLD CHRONICLE

Problems of Men and Women Students in India

About eighteen months ago, a big sensation was caused in Nagpur by a case of double suicide. A Parsee young woman and a Hindu youth, both students of the local college, committed suicide by drowning themselves in a lake, as their friendship was disapproved and marriage disallowed. Again, the three sisters of a Calcutta family left a note behind them, saying that they were going to commit suicide by swallowing opium in order to relieve the anxiety of their father, who had to find large sums of money for their dowry in order to marry them off.

These two sad incidents are fairly representative of some of the difficulties that confront the Indian students today. Undoubtedly it is in the realm of friendship and marriage that most of their problems lie. The difficulties are due to the fact that India is still in the throes of adjusting itself to new ideologies and practices, and that the young folk are usually quick at the uptake as compared with their seniors at home. The youth of India today represents a generation of men and women which is called upon to perform the difficult task of assimilating the best in Western civilization while conserving that which is of abiding value in its national culture. Thus the problem resolves itself into a problem of the discrimination of values.

Co-education is very common in India nowadays. There is a great desire on the part of men and women students to know and to understand one another, and to contract friendships which may or may not ripen into marriage. It is the fear of gossip and criticism that drives the young folks to resort to clandestine methods. Thus, while healthy companionship between sexes is advocated in theory, it is not allowed in practice. Another instance of the clash of youth with the older generation is in the interpretation of "personal freedom". The parents of girls are willing to let their daughters study in colleges, are ready to give them a liberal education, but do not let their children exercise freedom in choosing a partner.

The rise in the standard of living, and the acute unemployment in the country, have been responsible for the growing disinclination among young men with regard to marriage. A number of young men refuse to marry because they cannot afford it. The result is that

there are numbers of young women in the country today who wish to get married but cannot find husbands. The dowry system, which has by no means disappeared, is responsible to some extent for bringing about this situation. It is tragic that our young men and women feel impotent when they are face to face with evils such as the dowry system and the caste system. It is a curious phenomenon that a highly-qualified girl in India has to reckon with the possibility of not getting married at all. Though careers for qualified young women are available, the average Indian young woman still looks to marriage as the best and most honourable vocation befitting a woman. (It is possible that a number of women may disagree with me here !)

Mention must be made here of matrimonial alliances between Christian girls and non-Christian men. These are on the increase in the Northern Provinces of India. In some cases Christian women have had to accept proposals for marriage from non-Christians in the absence of any from Christian men. Sooner or later the Indian Church will have to reckon with the problem of such mixed marriages, which have far-reaching consequences. In passing it may be noted that such marriages fail to conform either to the Hindu or to the Christian ideal of marriage.

There seems to be a certain amount of tension in the ideologies of men and women students with reference to economics. Men are not too happy at times about the higher education of women, for fear that the latter may compete with them for jobs. The women feel that if once they are economically independent, they may be able to shake off the last vestige of submission to men. The mutual suspicion in this connection may be traced to the prevalence of mistaken notions about education on both sides. It is a pity that we do not look upon education as a discipline and enlightenment, but consider it as an economic weapon. Thus, the need of our generation is to re-discover the meaning and purpose of education.

Whenever the woman student thinks or speaks of her emancipation, she does so in terms of the freedom which her Western sisters enjoy, and which, from a distance, seems most desirable. The failure to think of her freedom independently of the ideologies current in the West constitutes a great difficulty. Though it seems inevitable for the time being that we should copy the West in a good many things, it must be said that it is not at all desirable for the Indian woman to walk closely in the footsteps of her sisters in the West. Here again, what we need is assimilation rather than imitation.

Religion as such does not present any problem to the average student, man or woman, as it is considered to be a disruptive in-

fluence and an opiate. Community of religious ideas or ideals very seldom forms the basis of friendship or of marriage between a young man and woman. Religion is still viewed in terms of religions. One of the stupendous tasks of any group seeking to serve the students is to combat this religious apathy among students, and make them see that the pattern to copy or follow is the God-man relationship in all departments of human life. Mere advocacy of any one religion often baffles students and forces scepticism into their life.

That there is need for better understanding between the women and the men students is recognized by every one. But people are not prepared to take the risks involved in providing opportunities for better understanding, because in India, in any given situation, it is the woman that suffers most if anything goes wrong. Probably the time has come when courageous action should be taken in this respect by all those concerned. The women's problem as a whole is strewn with all manner of difficulties; and to pioneer the women's movement in India needs men and women of deep piety, thorough discipline, and prophetic vision.

In this connection, the Student Christian Movement has a great opportunity and responsibility. Do our men and women know the situation? Are we willing to tackle the problem and pay the price for bringing about a change in the situation? Whether we are going to succeed or not, try we must. In our daily quiet time we shall have to see things as God sees them, and learn to agonize with Him. When we stand before Him morning after morning, He may place His hand on us and require us to be "speakers" for Him. Our study groups are planned that we may study the situation and learn to think together. But no one can stop at praying and thinking about any given problem. We have to act, fearlessly and decisively. But it is possible that with all our acting we may not make even a dint on the situation.

*"Let no man think that sudden in a minute
All is accomplished and the work is done; —
Though with thine earliest dawn thou shouldst begin it,
Scarce were it ended in thy setting sun."*

E. SAMBAYYA.

Fifty Years Ago at Mount Hermon

Fifty years ago a conference was held at Mount Hermon in the U.S.A. to which the Student Volunteer Movements, and indirectly the whole World's Student Christian Federation, owe their very existence. Of all stories from Student Christian Movement history this one makes the most direct appeal to our imagination and gives us the deepest sense of gratitude to the pioneers of those early days. It is a privilege to have the story told by one of those pioneers who did more than any one else to implement the vision given to the students of many countries assembled at Mount Hermon.

Today Student Summer Conferences are so common that it is not easy for us to put ourselves in the place of those who were members of the first Christian Student Summer gathering. The suggestion to hold such a conference was made by the two Student Y.M.C.A. Secretaries, Luther D. Wishard and Charles K. Ober to Mr. Dwight L. Moody, the evangelist, in April 1886. At first Mr. Moody was slow to believe that over 200 students would meet for a whole month to study the Bible. At last the consent of Mr. Moody was secured and the time agreed on was 26 days in the month of July that same year.

On July 6, 250 delegates assembled for their first meeting. They came from 90 different colleges, representing 26 states and Canada. According to the circular of announcement this conference was called "A World Summer School for Bible Study". Mr. Moody presided over all the main meetings. Every forenoon at ten o'clock, addresses were given for two hours on the central truths of the Bible and questions were answered by Mr. Moody and the Bible teachers associated with him. Each afternoon we had athletics led by James B. Reynolds of Yale, and a sunset hour meeting was held daily on "Round Top". The place of meeting was Mount Hermon, Mass., across the river from Northfield which later became a great conference centre. At the opening meeting of the Conference Mr. Moody said: "I have been asked for programs. I hate programs and I don't have any, then I can't break them. If you want to know what is ahead, we don't know except that we will have a good time. We want to stir you up and get you in love with the Bible, and those of you, who have a voice, in love with music." A good musician was secured to lead the singing.

For two-and-a-half years before this Conference convened a group of Students were meeting on Sunday afternoons in Princeton to consider and pray for missions. They had signed the following covenant: "We are willing and desirous, God permitting, to become foreign missionaries". We used to gather in my father's home and frequently he addressed us, referring to his experiences for thirty years as a mission-

ary in India. He said : " The question is not why should you go as missionaries, but why should you *not* go, since the need in unevangelized lands is so much greater than it is here and the labourers are so few ". He also emphasized the duty of trying to evangelize the world in *our* generation. After he had spoken we turned to prayer. In an adjoining room another was praying. God alone knows what the Student Volunteer Movement owes to the prayers of my sister Grace.

Mr. Wishard came to Princeton to secure a delegation for Mount Hermon and insisted upon my attending the Conference. Before I left, my sister said : " I believe our prayers will be answered at Mount Hermon and that there our Princeton beginnings will become inter-collegiate ". She also prophesied, as I recall, that a hundred volunteers would be secured for missionary service. I went to Mount Hermon burdened with a passion to arouse fellow students to a sense of the world's need and what could be done in *our* generation. At the conference it was found that 21 of the 250 delegates were already looking forward to service in the foreign mission field. We decided to assemble daily for prayer in the room where there is now a commemorative tablet and then to present personally the missionary appeal to other delegates. Nearly two weeks elapsed before any missionary address was delivered, but the missionary interest was growing all the time. As Dr. Mott once said : " Men talked missions every where — running, tramping, eating ! "

Mr. Moody had not planned any platform meeting for missions until I asked him if ten of us students could speak some evening on this theme representing ten different Nations : Persia, Japan, India, China, Siam, Armenia, American Indians, Denmark, Germany, Norway — every one ending his address with the words : " God is love " in the language of the land of his birth. This meeting of " The Ten Nations " was the high watermark of the Conference. Seldom has one seen an audience under the sway of God's Spirit as it was that night. The delegates withdrew to their rooms or went out under the great trees to wait on God for guidance. A professor in a theological seminary in Chicago has said that the most sacred spot on earth for him is a tree at Mount Hermon where he yielded his life to God and volunteered for missionary service. John R. Mott said that after the meeting of " The Ten Nations ", as it was called, he spent more than one night in prayer, doing " conclusive thinking ". He, too, signed the Princeton declaration. During the eight days that followed the meeting of " The Ten Nations " there were great searchings of heart and great resolves, with the result that seventy-eight more men volunteered. Before the conference closed, while the ninety-nine who had signed the declaration were meeting for prayer, another joined our ranks : one hundred volunteers ! At the request of the volunteers four of us were appointed to visit the Colleges in the

interest of this Student Volunteer Movement. But as three felt unable to do so John N. Forman, one of the original Princeton group, was asked to accompany me on the tour. During the academic year 1886-1887 we visited one hundred and sixty-two institutions of learning. Two thousand one hundred and six volunteers were enrolled, about 500 being women. The Rev. James McCosh, D.D., President of Princeton College, wrote as follows to the press :

“ I am amazed at their success. I believe that those who have offered to go to the mission field are sincere and thoroughly in earnest. Has any such offering of living men and women been presented in this age — in this country — in any age, or any country, since the day of Pentecost?”

Long before the Mount Hermon Conference was held my sister and I prayed daily that ultimately a thousand student volunteers might enter upon Foreign Missionary service — since then more than 13,000 student Volunteers from Canada and U.S.A. have gone to mission fields. God has answered prayer above what we asked or thought.

Robert P. WILDER.

The Student Christian Movement in Norway Today

In order to understand our present position, we must look back a little in time. In the first quarter of this century, the ideas of the liberal theology gained more and more ground in the life of the S.C.M., and the turn which the Norwegian Church conflict took in 1920, intensifying the cleavage between liberal and conservative theology, forced the S.C.M. more and more to the liberal wing. The conservative portion of the Movement therefore separated in 1923 and formed its own organization (the so-called Hallesbye Movement). This organization, which unites an orthodox doctrine with a pietistic method of work, at once gained great significance, and is today the stronger of the two Movements.

The development of the S.C.M. during the following years was characterized by a growingly strong reaction against liberalism, influenced especially by the dialectical theology. Through Message Study, we have learnt that our message is Jesus Christ and He alone. Two visits by Dr. W.A. Visser 't Hooft and Dr. Hanns Lilje, and the Edinburgh Quadrennial Conference of the British S.C.M. in 1933, where we had a large delegation, were also of great importance.

Together with this reaction there went a positive movement towards the Church. We learned what the Church was, and also began to live as members of the Church. The most important thing

was that the members came together to pray, and that we at least talked about doing "personal work" among our fellow-students.

At the big Northern Conference at Lillehammer in 1934 these things lay there and glowed, but did not really come to open expression.

The spark that kindled the fire was the Oxford Group Movement. In Autumn, 1934, Dr. Buchman came with a big "team" to Norway; and what happened as a result has been of extraordinary importance for the whole Norwegian Church.

Great things happened in the S.C.M. too. The larger part of the active members became members of the Group Movement. And now the situation is such that the people in our Movement who are not "Groupers" do not feel that they are "outsiders"; that is, the Group Movement has become an organic part of our whole work.

What, then, has been given us thereby? First of all I would mention the great extension of our work. The work has more than doubled its numbers. This year, like last year, we shall have four summer conferences, whereas earlier there were only one or two at most. We have won members who did not know of our existence before. And so on and so on.

The chief thing is, however, the spiritual renewal that has been given us. This has been very simple, and began with this fact, that we leaders of the Movement received new strength for complete surrender to God and God's action, and help in our personal difficulties, i.e. our sins.

These were not new thoughts or any single new theory. But what happened was that all our theories and thoughts and words suddenly became flesh and blood. Now we are doing all the things we used to talk about before; and so we have at last come out on to Kierkegaard's "70,000 fathoms of water", of which we had spoken so much.

A few examples will make this clearer. We had spoken of the fact that we ought to do evangelistic and "personal work" among our fellow-students. Now it is really happening that one student speaks quite openly with one of his comrades about Christianity and wins him for Christ. Secondly: We have had a study group on the subject of how to know the Will of God. There we have learnt, especially under the influence of the dialectical theology, that the Will of God is no general law, but that we find it in our existential situation. We had reached this insight theoretically, but had not done it, especially because we did not have the courage to make the venture of faith. In the "Quiet Time" of the Group Movement, all our theories have become practice. Here all our actual decisions are laid

before God ; and we believe in His Guidance when we render obedience. Thus God has become a living reality to us, and we can in faith see His action in everyday life.

Now we do not merely hold the view that Christianity is something existential ; now it *is* existential.

It is not necessary to say much concerning the great importance which our theoretical work has had, but it must also be clear that no theory would in the last resort have helped us if we had not been stimulated by the Group people to dare to devote our whole life to God.

And so the " Conferences " have become quite different. Now we no longer seek to solve the riddle of the world by means of addresses and discussions by important people whose theories go quite over the heads of most of the members. The most important things now are the personal talks and " personal work " between the Christian students and their comrades who are still uncertain. The point of contact is no longer the " interests " of the members, but their sins, which are far more real than their interests. Sin is the only point of contact for God's work with a human being.

That does not mean that all theoretical work is given up. In the last six months, such questions as " State and Church " and " Literature and Christianity " have been discussed.

Bible Study was never very successful in our Movement in recent years. Since the Group Movement, things have gone somewhat better ; but it is still very difficult to get people together into Bible Study circles. And yet the Bible is being read. A Bible-reading plan has been worked out which is used by nearly all members. But there is only very little understanding for the theological working-out of the thought of the Bible. That is probably due to the fact that most of our members are not theological students, and read the Bible in a much simpler way.

It is a very important fact that the isolated position of the S.C.M. in the life of the Church has been broken down. The conception of " Student Christianity " simply does not exist any longer, and our members take part to a great extent in the general Christian work.

There is then nothing new so far as thoughts are concerned. But we have received a new life which has completely changed ourselves and our work. Outwards : A new activity. Inwards : Confidence, frankness and true fellowship between the members and the leaders. Upwards : A new faith in the Lord Who can do all things and Who has called us to be His witnesses.

Our senior friends feel as though the early days of the S.C.M. had come back. And that is true. The S.C.M. has once again become a genuine evangelizing revival movement. But we are not ashamed of our history. Rather do we forget that which is behind, and reach forth to that which is coming — the Kingdom of God.

Alex L. JOHNSON.

BOOK REVIEWS

Women before God

MUTTER UND MAGD, das biblische Wort über die Frau. By Anna Paulsen. *Furche-Verlag, Berlin.* Price : RM. 2.70

We have been accustomed to a certain type of exegetical literature which takes its stand on a few isolated texts in order to enlighten us on "the Christian view of the position of women". What we want to find out is, however, something else : how God considers women and deals with them throughout history. This is what Anna Paulsen tries to show us in her study of two thousand years of Biblical history in which she describes feminine figures of various times and cultures. Without adding any superfluous comments, the author lets the stories of the Old and New Testaments speak for themselves. Thus we perceive how again and again God breaks through human limitations and turns to women directly, claiming their personal faith.

In the early times of Israel, when the only way for woman to take part in the destiny of her people was to become the mother of a son and thus to be a link in the chain of generations leading on to the Messiah, God transformed her natural motherhood into a Divine vocation. This tradition leads on to Mary, in whom motherhood and virginity are perfectly united. With the coming of the Messiah the peculiar position of the chosen people has come to its fulfilment and with it the peculiar position of motherhood. The Church takes the place of the chosen people, and Mary, the Mother, has to descend from her high position and like everybody else to accept forgiveness from her Son. She is standing on the threshold of the ages, embodying two great feminine vocations, those of Mother and Virgin.

We can make a curious observation while we follow thus the destiny of woman throughout the ages. The estimation of woman is closely related to the degree of religious conviction of each period; in fact it might almost be called a religious barometer. Whenever secular values and distinctions prevail, women are ousted from cultural and religious life. But as soon as eternal reality draws near, women take their place in the community. Thus at the time of the prophets, women had a large share in religious life, and took part in many of the religious ceremonies. There were women too among the prophets. Later, as living faith froze into formal cult, when religion centred exclusively in sacrifice, women were considered as mere sex-beings and not admitted to any religious activity. When Jesus Christ came, He found the status of woman very low; the disciples were amazed that He talked to women at all (a thing which would have been self-evident in Old Israel), and again this attitude coincided with the fact that religion had become a system of Phari-saical ethics. It is not astonishing that woman's sudden rehabilitation in the early Christian community (the more so as the status of woman in Greece was low too) sometimes went to her head and obliged St. Paul to take some drastic measures.

The fundamental message which emerges from this excellent study is clearly expressed in a sentence which Anna Paulsen uses in relation to the social and legal position of women in Old Israel, but which is valid for women of all times: "*Das Entscheidende aber für die Geltung der Frau ist das Angesehen-werden von Gott; das sich Gott Gegenüberwissen ist der letzte Grund für ihre Personbe-wertung.*" We look forward to a further development of the theme of "Mother and Virgin", on which the author is working and in which she wants to deal more fully and more systematically with the questions that could not be treated in her first study-outline.

H. B.

“ Why Marry ? ”

“ WHY MARRY ? ” By Sybil Neville Rolfe. *Faber and Faber, London.*
Price : 3/6

Mrs. Neville-Rolfe, out of many years' experience in the social field, has written a book which we are sure will be of considerable help to many who are endeavouring to come to a fuller understanding of this, the most important realm of all human relationships. While supporting strongly the institution of marriage, she calls for a more enlightened and more intelligent attitude towards sexual problems than that which is often displayed. Drawing upon her experience of cases with which she has had to deal, she takes up successively in the first hundred pages of her book certain special problems such as friendship between members of two sexes and friendship between women, experiments in “ temporary ” marriage and changing partners, the honeymoon and marriage. The last part is devoted to setting out in greater detail the conclusions to which she is led by her examination of the case material in the preceding part of the book. Unlike so many writers on this subject who claim that education in sex matters will solve all the problems of sexual life, Mrs. Neville-Rolfe asserts emphatically that, while knowledge may remove the danger of exaggerated emotionalism, “ an understanding of the intellectual and spiritual implications of sex in the development of personality and of the racial and social implications of the stable family are also essential factors in the desired attitude of mind towards sex in life ”. But having made this assertion, we wish that the author had gone on to develop “ the intellectual and spiritual implications of sex ” instead of confining her attention almost entirely in the chapter on “ Sex and Personality ” to the physiological and psychological aspects of sex. Useful and important as the knowledge of these aspects is, alone it fails to provide the necessary dynamic power to grapple with the problems raised in this realm of life : a dynamic power which, we believe, belongs to the realm of the spirit. Still, there is much in this book which we believe, by its candour and sincerity, will have great value for many readers.

R. A. R.

Moralism against Pantheism

"IS CHRISTIANITY UNIQUE?" By Nicol Macnicol. *S.C.M. Press, London.* 1936. Price: 6s.

Dr. Macnicol believes that the "ultimate Armageddon of the Spirit" will be fought out between "those religions and philosophies which view all things as holding within themselves a purpose and significance that may be discovered and realized and that therefore, we conclude, are maintained by the will, and enshrine the thought, of a living God" and those other religions "for which, sooner or later, life is accepted as being no more than a chaos of unreality, a region of night and death". In his discussion of the Uniqueness of Christianity he is therefore specially interested in demonstrating the deep gulf between it and all forms of Pantheism. The main danger of Pantheism, which has paralyzed the Eastern nations and which has begun to exert a strong influence in the West, is its basic indifference to the fundamental distinction between good and evil and its denial of the worthwhileness of human effort. This is an important thesis and it is developed with great force. How timely these warnings against an uncritical syncretism are becomes very clear when Dr. Macnicol shows to what extent Pantheistic conceptions are actively propagated in so-called Christian nations.

But while we are grateful for his searching diagnosis, we find it difficult to agree with his therapeutics. It is true that Christianity is a supremely moral religion and that it makes life meaningful. But does that mean that we can "prove" the truth of Christianity by applying some generally valid test of moral efficiency?

Dr. Macnicol believes that this is indeed possible, and presents a new and in some ways original formulation of the old apologetic affirmation that Christianity can be shown to be unique by the fruits which it brings forth. He appeals to what he considers to be "a court than which there is none higher", which is variously described as "those elements in life which are universally recognized as precious", "the eternal values" or even "the enrichment of life". This appeal, it seems to him, provides us with a more objective standard of judgment than the appeal to the Uniqueness of Christ, for this latter appeal would bring us at once to the conclusion of our investigation.

Is this really so? Is there really an objective realm of values which is so clearly in accordance with the demands of life and of

reason that we can look up to it as the common tribunal for all mankind? Can those who believe in God's Revelation in Christ admit the existence of a truth higher than Revelation itself as a common "court than which there is none higher"? Or is the appeal to these general values perhaps just as much a *petitio principii* as the appeal to the Person of Christ, since we have derived these values from Him, directly or indirectly? Dr. Macnicol expresses sympathy for the point of view of those who hold that the Uniqueness of Christianity is nothing but the Uniqueness of God's act in Jesus Christ, but he believes that we must nevertheless go on with the building of bridges. He fears that a mere presentation of Jesus Christ without apologetics will lead us nowhere.

Is that fear justified? It would seem that there is plenty of evidence in contemporary history, e.g. in the growth of the new absolutisms of which Dr. Macnicol is so keenly aware, that a faith which dares to take its stand exclusively on its own inherent truth is not necessarily in danger of "apathy".

V. 't H.

Notes on Contributors and Articles

HENRIETTE BODDAERT's article represents a summary of a booklet which will soon be published by the Y.W.C.A. in Holland.

SUZANNE DE DIETRICH is Secretary of the World's Student Christian Federation, and author of *C'était l'Heure de l'Offrande*. She has just returned from a visit to South America, and will spend the autumn in Ceylon and India.

PAVLICK EVDOKIMOFF is a Russian who lives in Southern France. He graduated in theology at the Russian Academy in Paris, and was an active member of both the Russian and the French S.C.M. s.

ALEXANDER L. JOHNSON is General Secretary of the Norwegian Student Christian Movement.

WILLIAM E. KROLL is Minister of the Arlington Avenue Presbyterian Church at East Orange, New Jersey, and has been in intimate touch with the S.C.M. in the U.S.A. for many years.

ANNA PAULSEN is leader of the Bible School at the Burckhardthaus, Berlin (the headquarters of the German Y.W.C.A.). She is the author of *Mutter und Magd*, which is reviewed in this Number.

A. G. PITE is Headmaster of Weymouth College, Dorset. He was a Secretary of the British S.C.M. from 1923 to 1925, and is the author of *Christian Marriage and Modern Practice*.

ROLAND DE PURY is Pastor of the French Reformed Church at Moncoutant, Deux-Sèvres. He belongs to the group which until recently published *Hic et Nunc*.

E. SAMBAYYA is Secretary of the Student Christian Movement of India, Burma and Ceylon. He represented his country at the Java Conference of the Federation in 1933.

EDUARD THURNEISEN is Pastor of the Cathedral at Basle, and the author of *Das Wort Gottes und die Kirche*, *Dostojewski*, *Christoph Blumhardt*, etc. His article in this Number represents a lecture recently delivered in German Switzerland.

ROBERT P. WILDER, founder of the Student Volunteer Movement in the U.S.A., has devoted his life to evangelistic work in the universities of many countries.

The article by the EDITOR represents a lecture given at the Spring Conference of the S.C.M. of French Switzerland held at Orbe in April.

The writers of book reviews are R. Ambrose Reeves (of the W.S.C.F.), Henriette Boddaert and the Editor.

* * *

It is probable that the next Number of *The Student World*, the subject of which will be "*Christian Students in the Pacific Area*", will not appear until October 15, since it will contain several of the addresses to be given at the Pacific Area Conference of the W.S.C.F., to be held from August 23 to September 2 at Mills College, Oakland, California.

STUDENT CHRISTIAN MOVEMENT PRESS

Just published

SHAPING THE FUTURE

A Study in World Revolution. By Basil Mathews, Author of "The Clash of Colour", etc. 3s. 6d. and 2s. 6d. net.

Men's allegiance is claimed today by many new faiths as well as by the old religions. Have any of them power to shape a better world? Paganism and Christianity confront one another in both East and West. Christians are called to creative planning and adventurous action if they are to meet the situation.

Just published

THE CHRISTIAN ANSWER TO THE PROBLEM OF EVIL

By J. S. Whale, President of Cheshunt College, Cambridge. 2s. 6d. net.

A reprint of Broadcast Talks which have aroused widespread interest and produced a very large number of letters from listeners. The problem is one that cannot be ignored by thoughtful people and Mr. Whale's discussion of it is frank and forceful.

Just published

ECONOMICS AND GOD

By Malcolm Spencer, Secretary, Christian Social Council. 4s. and 2s. 6d. net.

This book attempts to show precisely what elements in our present economic structure must be cut away and replaced by the better foundation that Christ would lay.

IS CHRISTIANITY UNIQUE ?

By Nicol Maenicol, D. Litt., D.D. 6s. net.

A scholarly examination by one of the most distinguished students of Oriental religions, of the uniqueness of Christianity in the light of modern knowledge.

Cheap Edition of

DR. VISSER 'T HOOFT'S Book ANGLO-CATHOLICISM AND ORTHODOXY.

A Protestant View. 2s. 6d. net.

"The account of the Orthodox Churches is one of the best short accounts that has appeared in English... A book which no one should neglect who wishes to keep in touch with the larger movements of the religious consciousness in our time."

Times Literary Supplement.

58, Bloomsbury Street, London, W.C.1.